DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 706 SO 009 825

AUTHOR Schwartz, Edward
TITLE The Institute Papers: Towards a Recovery of Civic Idealism.
INSTITUTION Institute for the Study of Civic Values, Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Public Committee for the Humanities, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 49p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for the Study of Civic Values, 401 North Broad Street, Room 810, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19108 ($1.50 paper cover)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Citizen Participation; Citizenship; *Civic Belief; Community Development; *Democratic Values; *Human Dignity; Humanism; Institutional Research; *Labor Problems; *Philosophy; Political Science; Political Socialization; Program Descriptions; Social Change; Values

ABSTRACT

The philosophy, strategy, and program of the Institute for the Study of Civic Values are presented in this collection of articles. Intended as a means of disseminating the institute's work and ideas to a general audience, the booklet is presented in four sections. Each section offers a theoretical article, an outline or a summary of an educational program, and an article or news clipping that shows the impact of the institute's efforts. The first section examines civic idealism in modern society and describes goals of the institute in research, dialogue, and teaching about civic ideals. The gap between ideals and practice in American political parties, schools, and churches is examined. The second section defines dignity as a primary concern in the labor movement and compares union, industry, and political attempts at labor reform. Theoretical, political, and grass root suggestions for community development are presented in the third section, followed by suggestions for improving political leadership and promoting public participation in the fourth section. Additional readings for each section are listed. An outline for organizing neighborhood and community organizations, adopted from a 1975 institute conference, is provided. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the micrcfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135706

THE INSTITUTE PAPERS:
TOWARDS A RECOVERY OF CIVIC IDEALISM

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By
Edward Schwartz

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Edward A. Schwartz

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

SP 009 825

The Institute Papers present the basic philosophy, strategy, and program of the Institute for the Study of Civic Values, a non-profit, educational organization devoted to promoting civic idealism in America. Located in Philadelphia, we bring philosophers, labor educators, theologians, and community activists together to explore the crisis of values today, and what we can do about it.

The Institute Papers are made possible by grants from the Max and Anna Leveinson Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania, and by the generous contribution of the authors.

Institute for the Study of Civic Values
401 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19108

Copyright ©1975, by the
Institute for the Study of Civic Values

Printed by the Philadelphia Resistance Print Shop
Box 3310, Philadelphia, Pa. 19130
A Unionized Printing Collective

Typeset by Common Sense
P.O. Box 3310, Philadelphia, Pa. 19130
A Community Newspaper and Typesetting Service

Cover Design by Deborah Thomas and Martin Goldensohn

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I Civic Idealism. 1

"The Institute for the Study of Civic Values: Philosophy, Strategy, Program". 3
Edward Schwartz

Civic Ideals and Modern Institutions: A Six Session Study Group 9

For Additional Reading 12

Section II Dignity 13

Contemporary Labor Problems: The Search for Dignity (Excerpts) 15
Union Leadership Academy
Edward Schwartz

Introduction. 15

Session I: The Roots of Dignity 16

A. Dignity and Citizenship 16

B. Dignity and Work 16

Sessions II-VIII: Summary 21

For Additional Reading 22

Section III Community. 23

"Observations on Community" 25
John Schaar

"Communitarianism vs. Liberalism: Does it Make Any Difference?". 28
Wilson C. McWilliams, Jr.

"The Mayor's Proposed Community Development Block Grant Proposal:
The View from the Neighborhoods" (Excerpts) 31
Bill Callahan

For Additional Reading 33

Section IV Participation 35

"Political Leadership: A Common Search for the Possible" 37
Dennis Bathory

Promoting Public Participation. 41

The Future of Philadelphia: Three Program Guides 41

Public Employees in Philadelphia's Future 41

Jobs and the Economy 43

Neighborhoods: How Do We Get Power? 43

Conference on Community Organizing 46

"Organizing Outline for
Organizing Neighborhood and Community Organizations" 46
J. Paul MacGruther

"Block Organizing Workshops" 48
Bonnie Kowalski

"Neighborhoods and Bars" 49
Conrad Weiler

"Mental Health Boards and Community Participation" 50
Jane Shull

For Additional Reading 51

Keeping in Touch with the Institute 52

SECTION 1. CIVIC IDEALISM

THE INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF CIVIC VALUES
PHILOSOPHY, STRATEGY, PROGRAM

EDWARD SCHWARTZ

A. FIRST STEPS

In October 1973, the Institute for the Study of Civic Values was founded as a non-profit, educational institution in Philadelphia.

Included among the founders were Edward Schwartz, former national President of the National Student Association, author of *Will the Revolution Succeed?*; Wilson C. McWilliams, Professor of Government at Rutgers University, author of *The Idea of Fraternity in America*; Alice Hoffman, Assistant Professor of Labor History at Penn State, recently elected President of the Oral History Association; George Bonham, Editor, *Change Magazine*; John Schaar, Professor of Politics at the University of California, Santa Cruz, author, *Escape from Authority* and *Loyalty in America*; Rev. H. Daehler Hayes, Minister of the Old First Reformed Church in Philadelphia; Bernard Dinkin, Education Director of Amalgamated Clothing Workers in Philadelphia; and Marilyn Young, now a regional Director of the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs.

Since 1973, Don Dalena, Public Relations Department of the United Steel Workers of America and author of numerous articles on the problems of working people; and Ann Jordan, a member of Governor Milton Shapp's Eastern Pa. staff and a leader in the Black Women's Political Caucus have joined the Institute Board. Many others have become involved with Institute Task Forces as Associates. We have raised funds to support a full-time paid staff. Indeed, more than 50 scholars and public leaders are now working with the Institute on projects of mutual concern.

We represent different fields – politics, education, labor, religion, writing. We have played different roles in the movements for change of the 60's and 70's. We disagree on many specific issues facing the country. Yet, we are united on two basic points: First, that something must be done to restore public confidence in America's best ideals; Second, that a center for research, dialogue, and teaching about these ideals can make a valuable contribution to the effort.

Since its founding, the Institute has taken important steps to achieve its basic goals. In Philadelphia, we have sponsored public forums with industrial workers, public employees, and neighborhood leaders on such diverse topics as "Work and Civic Values", "The Economic Crisis and the Future of Philadelphia", "Public Employees and Public Responsiblity", and "Neighborhoods: How Do We Get Power?" Our newsletter, *Neighborhoods*, reaches over 1,000 local community leaders, providing information and ideas as to how neighborhoods can be restored as vital centers of urban life. We have played a leading role in forcing public re-evaluation of strategies for community development, economic revival, and public service.

We have had an impact beyond Philadelphia as well. Labor educators throughout the country are becoming familiar with our research on "dignity" as a new conception of a citizen's and a worker's basic self-interest. Indeed, courses in Theories of the Labor Movement and Contemporary Labor Problems developed by Institute Board members are now used in labor classes in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and West Virginia through the Union Leadership Academy. A growing network of political philosophers is assisting the Institute in developing other curricular materials that relate basic ideals and values to contemporary problems and institutions.

At this point, therefore, it is important to bring this work to the attention of a wider audience. Many people in Philadelphia and elsewhere have become aware of specific projects of the Institute. They are now asking for more. What are our goals? How are we trying to achieve them? How do our programs relate to one another? What, ultimately, do we hope to accomplish?

As will become apparent, these answers will emerge over time; our agenda is complex. Yet, the papers that follow spell out the directions in which we are moving – and why we have chosen them.

B. THE AGENDA

There is nothing new in the Institute's basic agenda. It's as old as America. We believe that "liberty and justice for all" remains the country's most valid goal, if only we would take it seriously. We further believe that active citizen involvement in the decisions that affect us is critical to the vitality of a democratic society. Our aim, therefore, is a recovery of political faith through the development of a coherent program of political education – one which applies the nation's highest ideals to the complex issues of modern life.

The problem lies in putting the program together. There is great cynicism about higher values today. Up to the recent past, production was supposed to solve all problems – make the poor richer without penalizing the rich; close the gap between the industrial and developing nations; establish harmony between management and labor. All an individual had to do was work hard, stay out of other people's way, and accept the judgments of the experts. The system would take care of itself.

Now that this system is breaking down, citizens find themselves in a quandary. They no longer know what they have a right to demand from society, who in government would have the power to respond, what the consequences of any given response might be. Of course, they are angry. Even worse, they are bewildered. The combination of the two adds up to the breakdown of public confidence in institutions and leaders widely reflected in the polls. The 60's showed us that production in itself does not create a high public morality. The 70's are demonstrating that even an impeachment in the name of high political morality does not automatically yield a new politics. In the absence of a strategy for change, it merely yields frustrations with the old politics.

C. TAKING PUBLIC PROMISES SERIOUSLY

The Institute contends that a new politics, a politics that aims at improving the quality of life, will emerge only when citizens feel that they have a right to demand it. This feeling, in turn, will depend upon what we come to expect from public and private institutions. When expectations are high, people build movements to fulfill them. When expectations are low, these same people dismiss the worst exploitation as "human nature" or "the way the world is." Oppression in itself does not create social change. If it did, there would be revolutions everywhere. People revolt when a system betrays them – when it fails to live up to its own best promises. Public leaders who want citizens to forget the pledges of previous generations do so at their peril. If the citizens take these pledges seriously, they will resist.

The Institute's programs and materials, then, aim at examining the public promises of this country. This is what we mean by "civic values". We are not content to let the historic pledges of justice, equality, and democracy stand as vague ideas, without meaning, useful only as rhetoric to justify what leaders would do anyway. To us, these principles are the standards against which we ought measure ourselves and one another. The apostles of limitless production have had 100 years to demonstrate that their vision is adequate to hold society together. They have failed. Millions of Americans are now questioning whether the country can even survive. The Institute insists that survival depends first upon how seriously citizens are prepared to take our own best founding ideals.

To be sure, examining public values is difficult. "What is justice?" was a knotty problem when Plato raised it. It is even more complex now. Do we mean social justice or merely legal justice? Are we talking about equality of opportunity or equality of results? Assuming that we could agree on the characteristics of a just society, is every strategy to achieve it equally just? Why should citizens even care about justice? Isn't the free market for jobs and services an adequate distribution in itself?

Even the value of public participation raises a number of questions. Why is it so critical to democracy? Why shouldn't elected leaders make all decisions without pressure from their constituents? Should working people control the workplace, neighborhood residents control neighborhood institutions, or should managers and administrators exercise effective power in these areas? What if popular sentiment on an issue supports great injustice to a specific group or groups? How should public leaders and institutions resolve the conflict?

These are complicated issues. We would not be facing so many crises if they were easy. Yet, their very complexity should show us the importance of facing them head-on. If we can't even define justice, how do we expect to achieve it? If we can't even justify public participation, how do we expect to promote it? Perhaps our obsession with technology and production *has* eliminated a concern for principles and values from education and politics. Isn't it time that we fought back? This is what the Institute is prepared to do.

D. THE PERILS OF PRODUCTION AS PRINCIPLE

As a first step, we must evaluate the state of public values today. What difference has it made that production has been our major goal for most of this century? How have the values of industry affected personal notions of success and failure? What have they done to our traditional faith in justice and democracy? How have conservative and liberal leaders responded to growing public pressure to revive these historic ideals? Where do we stand today? These questions bear examining.

Production has always meant one thing to Americans – a higher standard of living over time. Its appeal has been powerful because of its simplicity, its visibility, and its measurability. A citizen can easily understand the proposition that with hard work, he or she will acquire greater purchasing power, as long as it proves true. For millions of Americans – at least through the middle 60's – it did prove true. They could see the results, for themselves and for the country. It didn't matter to them that corporations were greatly expanding their power over the government and the economy. As long as they were doing better than they did the previous year – and much better than their parents did – they were satisfied. The real value here was "progress", both personal and collective.

Yet material progress without regard for human relationships destroys social values in the process. Citizens who are told to compare themselves only to the past soon turn away from the moral realities of the present. Improvements in their own standard of living blinds them to widening gaps within the system as a whole. We can understand this process readily when we see how the philosophy of production affects traditional notions of justice and democracy.

The original conception of justice, both religious and Platonic was, "to give each citizen his or her due". It assumed a community of friends, engaged in a common life, trying to determine what role each person could play in promoting the good of all. The just community was one in which each citizen had found a place and was rewarded adequately for the contribution. There were no winners or losers. Everyone was assumed worthy of respect. The concept is as old as *Leviticus*:

19:13 You shall not oppress your neighbor or rob him. The wages of a hired servant shall not remain with you all night until the morning.

:14 You shall not curse the deaf or put a stumbling block before the blind, but you shall fear your God: I am the Lord.

:15 You shall do no injustice in judgment; you shall not be partial to the poor or defer to the great, but in righteousness shall you judge your neighbor. You shall not go up and down as a slanderer among your people, and you shall not stand forth against the life of your neighbor: I am the Lord.

A society that makes production its major goal automatically perverts this conception of justice. It doesn't matter who controls the process. Technology rather than morality becomes the focus of education; students develop technical skills without strong values to guide them. Most of the system's economic and social rewards go to technicians as well, even if blue-collar workers are performing equally useful service to the country. People no longer feel that they owe something to one another. We are promised only an equal chance to win the competitive game. The rules of the game themselves become the standard of justice, regardless of the outcome. The goals of the game are beyond question. Such is the impact of production on the idea that we should not be "partial to the poor or defer to the great, but in righteousness shall you judge your neighbor."

Technology destroys opportunities for democratic participation as well. Both classical and modern students of politics have agreed that democracy works best in small communities, where citizens can work out common problems with one another. "In every body politic there is a maximum strength which it cannot exceed and which it only loses by increasing in size", Rousseau warned. "Every extension of the social tie means its relaxation; and, generally speaking, a small State is stronger in proportion than a great one." Recently, two political scientists, Sidney Verba and Norman Nie, have reached the same conclusion in examining participation in America. All other things being equal, they found that activism flourishes in small, isolated cities of between 10,000 and 50,000. The larger the city, the less the citizen involvement. Thus, as with Rousseau, Verba and Nie conclude that democracy functions best where the community is small.

Yet, as we know, industrialization and urbanization have driven most small cities out of existence. Technology requires whole nations, even the world, to make best use of raw materials and natural resources. Producers, in turn, seek world-wide markets for their goods. No community can control this process. No one nation can control it. Working people must merely follow industries wherever they move, or lose their jobs. How can they become strongly enough attached or committed to any one community to think about changing it? What effective decision can any one community or city government make? Thus, even though the affluence of the country now permits broad citizen involvement in decisions, the political institutions themselves no longer encourage it. As Verba and Nie put it, "citizens are participating more now, but enjoying it less."

Thus, respect for justice and democracy has declined as technology and production has advanced. The problem lies not merely with the process of industrialism – although this is bad enough. The problem lies with the worship of industrialism. Technology becomes a religion; production becomes a god. We forget that the goods of the world are scarce, that there aren't enough resources for everyone to live equally well. By the time we must confront real scarcities in energy, in food, in raw materials – we lack a system of values to permit a fair distribution of the wealth and a conception of politics to allow government to assume leadership of the process. It's every group for itself, and in the end, everyone loses – even the rich. Ultimately, the rich lose most of all, in fact, in tangible wealth and power and in national esteem. If they are the first ones to persuade us to rely on production, they become the first ones to face the anger of a people betrayed and destroyed by its failures.

America has not reached this cataclysmic stage yet, but we could be heading toward it. Ironically, for the moment, at least, the conservatives have been the main beneficiaries. They have understood well that the dominant popular demand in a crisis is security. They have responded. Their platforms promise security from crime; security from new groups seeking access to scarce jobs and services; security from the "new Morality" that emerges as the "work ethic" breaks down; security from facing up to the crisis of production itself. The only security that they do not offer is economic security, but citizens aren't sure that economic security can exist anymore. In the absence of a clear alternative, the people vote conservative in the belief that at least they take security seriously.

The liberals, in turn, don't know what to do. There is irony here, too. For all their rhetoric about equality and justice, it was the liberals who defended security during the period between the New Deal and the 60's. In every major campaign, we learned that it was a liberal administration that rescued us from a Depression; liberals that offered unions the security of collective bargaining; liberals that gave Social Security to senior citizens; and liberal government that brought economic security to everyone. It was the conservatives during this period who talked about

individual initiative and risk. The liberals, in fact, were the voice of stability, even if they called it progress.

Now, however, liberalism has no satisfactory answers to the new problems of security. Liberal respect for the rights of individuals and due process prevents them adopting the harsh tactics of the Right in dealing with crime in the streets. Alternatively, liberal reluctance to impose tough controls on industry prevents them from demanding economic justice where production has failed. Liberal expressions of outrage against big oil and agri-business have been feeble, indeed. Besides, even if some liberals do favor a tougher role for government now, they have backed a philosophy of private economic growth for so long that it will take time to persuade the public to shift gears.

Indeed, we might say that liberalism itself has grown flabby in its reliance on production. Liberals are so proud of their public programs that they have come to tolerate the unjust tax system that pays for them. Older liberals have relied on military spending as a strategy for economic growth for so long that their successors today can't cut military waste without costing thousands of jobs. Urban liberals have tried so hard to woo the middle class and big business back to the cities that they have lost touch with the needs of urban residents themselves. The urban history of the past two decades is strewn with the wreckage of low-income neighborhoods demolished to make way for the middle class. Did middle class people come back? Hardly. They stayed where they were, and the businesses merely moved out to the suburbs to join them. This was the result of liberal policy for the cities.

Thus, the American people now confront a conservative government unable to solve the economic crisis of production, with a liberal opposition unable to handle the social crisis. In response, citizens vote "no confidence" in both sides. Unfortunately, this hostility to leaders and institutions does not reflect a coherent program of action in itself. If it did, at least one of the major parties would adopt it. Yet, the people are as confused as their leaders. Why shouldn't they be? If the "professionals" don't know what to do, why should the rest of us? We want answers, not a new list of questions.

Many public leaders complain that the people are inconsistent. We support tough action to deal with the corporations, but equally tough action to deal with crime in the streets. We demand participation in politics, but applaud when a major figure like Reverend Jesse Jackson attacks us for a breakdown of morality and discipline. We insist upon respect from political and economic insititutions, but simultaneously long for aggressive, decisive leadership that won't kowtow to the "special interests". We accuse politicians of being on both sides of the spectrum, but we often seem to be on both sides as well.

Perhaps the answer to these contradictions lies in an understanding of the American democratic tradition. Historically, this tradition did emphasize themes in politics that now have drifted apart. Early American democrats were conservative in their religious beliefs, in their loyalty to specific communities, in their willingness to allow political leaders to set the moral standards of the nation. At the same time, they were radical in their economic views, demanding that industry hold itself accountable to the Golden Rule and to democratic government. If movements like the Populist Movement failed in themselves, they bequeathed to modern America a moral framework that still acts as a national conscience. From this perspective, then, it is not surprising that many of us still relate the breakdown of political and economic institutions to a breakdown of public and private values. Modern corporate executives and liberal politicians may have given up thinking about politics in moral terms, but the ordinary citizens have not. The first step to a recovery of political faith, in fact, may lie in restoring the connections.

This is what the Institute for the Study of Civic Values is trying to do.

E. DIGNITY, COMMUNITY, PARTICIPATION

At present, we are exploring three important concepts – "dignity", "community" and "participation".

By "dignity", we mean a person's worth in the overall scheme of things. It provides a framework for examining the moral dimensions of self-interest.

By "community", we mean the effort of citizens to come together in pursuit of shared ideals. We can evaluate society itself in terms of whether it promotes or inhibits community.

By "participation", we mean the involvement of citizens in all decisions that affect them. It is a useful measure of the responsiveness of public and private institutions to the people. To what extent do they promote participation?

The papers in this volume explore the implications of each of these ideas. Here, we will examine how they relate to the broad effort to promote civic idealism in society itself.

The concept of "dignity" as self-interest allows us to go beyond the notion that our basic instincts are all materialistic and acquisitive. Defenders of industrial or "post-industrial" society try to persuade us of this cheap view of human nature. In the absence of any alternative, they succeed. How often have we read that the only people with ideals are people who can afford them? How many times have we asked, when we hear that a group is working for broad principles, "what's in it for them?" How many people have themselves given up on important social causes in the belief that "you can't change human nature?" This is the impact of the notion that we are no better than animals, merely more effective in the struggle for power.

Unfortunately, the theory raises as many questions as it answers. If everyone is power-hungry, what accounts for the strong religious beliefs of so many people, beliefs that do keep them out of the ruthless struggle for material gain? Why do both rural and urban residents today often fight even potentially profitable programs for economic development when they threaten other values and institutions in the community? Even admitting that full-time activists are rare, how can they exist at all? If human beings are only and always self-seeking, how can any human being be anything else? Or are they the exceptions that prove the rule? A sad theory it is that admits so many exceptions.

We submit that while wealth and power are two important strategies for dignity, dignity itself – a sense of worth – remains the basic goal. Great wealth is attractive because it offers personal comfort and economic power. We can measure it, so we know exactly where we stand. It gives some people the luxury of feeling more important than others simply because they own more than others. It challenges even the humblest member of the community to participate in the great competitive game. Yet, it also creates one major problem: the losers of the game often end up with almost no dignity at all. If they don't own anything, they aren't worth anything. Whole areas of human life are systematically crushed in the process.

When people take dignity seriously in itself, they start asking questions that transcend the search for wealth. What can we do for one another? On what basis should we be rewarded for our contributions? What institutions best challenge and honor us? We must examine how we value one another – and what we value in ourselves. Ultimately, we must come to grips with the idea of justice – the system where each citizen does receive respect for his or her contribution, where all citizens share a sense of dignity. By focusing on dignity first, however, people can explore the higher ideal of justice in a way that makes sense to the self.

The value of "community" encourages people to explore alternatives to private gain as well. At first, it seems to be a goal – an image of fellowship and communion that stands in sharp contrast to the "rugged individualism" of modern life. In large cities, we face either the isolation of our homes or the loneliness of the streets. We long for what we imagine to be the friendly spirit of the old small towns. When bulldozers threaten to level a neighborhood, we rise up to defend it. Even mobility itself can be threatening, separating us from family, friends, and familiar places. In every case, we think of community as the alternative – our protection against the private goals that a competitive system sets for us.

The more we think about community, however, the less of a goal it seems to be by itself. Community for what? An army creates a community of battle. A corporation creates a community of producers. A political party builds community among its partisans. A church tries to establish a community of worship. Are all these communities consistent, or do they work at cross purposes? What kind of community do we really want?

The Institute contends that the nature of a community depends upon its goals. The community of an army can last no longer than the war, as professor McWilliams observes in these papers. A community organized to promote high moral ideals, by contrast, can last as long as its members take the ideals seriously and understand their own limitations in pursuing them on their own. Those who want to preserve communities, then, must work constantly to find new, more challenging common goals for people. In previous periods of our history, ethnic background and race helped define these goals. Are these principles of community still valid, or must we develop new ones? An important public debate is being fought over this very issue. The critical point, however, is that the idea of community helps us think about how and why citizens work together in the face of the many forces in society that are pulling us apart.

The idea of community also helps us examine the social role of modern institutions. If goals define a community, structures make it possible. Some institutions may make community impossible, therefore, either by preventing debate over issues that lead to cooperative movements or by keeping people apart altogether. We can evaluate all institutions from this perspective. Do they unite us or divide us? Do they promote discussion of common goals, or do they force us to concentrate entirely on our own, private objectives? Do they preserve or destroy existing communities? Do instututions care about community in any sense? These are important questions that we can start asking.

Finally, we can hold instututions accountable to the value of participation. In a technological society, most bureaucracies encourage only limited involvement in their operation. The important decisions are supposed to be made by experts. They know best, after all. Too much participation just wastes time. Oscar Wilde once said that he wouldn't like socialism because it would require too many meetings. Most bureaucrats today take this attitude about democracy itself.

Yet, in increasing numbers, citizens do want to participate in the decisions that affect them. We're insulted when we're left out–our dignity is offended. We lose the chance to work with friends to develop common goals–our communities are undermined. Most of the time, the decisions themselves contradict what we want. Thus, both dignity and community depend upon our participation in all aspects of American life. We must learn how to define political objectives, to articulate them, and to pursue them with the powers-that-be. We must convince ourselves that *we are* the powers-that-be. We need to develop the knowledge and political competence required to meet this responsibility. Once we acquire these skills, we must demand that all institutions promote participation–and that we become involved in the process.

Thus, by exploring the basic ideas of dignity, community, and participation, the Institute relates fundamental moral values to problems that citizens confront in their everyday lives. Through this inquiry, we can examine virtually every issue that society now faces.

F. THE STRATEGY

How do we get these ideas across? We are a non-profit educational instutution. We do not endorse candidates. We do not organize lobbying campaigns for legislation. What , then, is our strategy for change? We operate at three levels–theoretical, educational, and institutional . We have established specific objectives for each. We already are working to achieve them.

In developing theory, the Institute is promoting a growing school of political philosophy that views a recovery of political idealism as being critical to the restoration of moral values in society as a whole. Professors Wilson Carey McWilliams, John Schaar, and Sheldon Wolin are central figures here, widely known for important analyses, respectively, of community (*The Idea of Fraternity in America*), loyalty (*Loyalty in America*), and civic idealism itself (*Politics and Vision*).

These theorists are now cooperating with the Institute, as are two generations of their students. Together, we are exploring problems of political leadership and social change, as well as, new theory that relates to the specific values that we are examining. Future articles and books developed by the Institute will reflect this continuing research. Thus, if B. F. Skinner's Harvard-based institute has formulated the main theories of behavioralism; if *The Public Interest* has become that national sounding-board for neo-conservatism, the Institute for the Study of Civic Values hopes to stimulate analysis of civic idealism as a distinctive school of American political thought.

Educationally, we are developing curricula that explore issues of value as well. Our initial projects have concentrated on designing courses in worker education – *Contemporary Labor Problems, Theories of the Labor Movement, Labor and Society* – inasmuch as this is an expanding field for which little material exists. Here, we are as assisted by many of the foremost labor educators in the country, including Larry Rogin, author of *Labor Education in the United States*; Norman Eiger, Associate Director of the Rutgers Labor Education Center; Anne Nelson, Director of Cornell's Trade Union Women's Studies Program; and Alice Hoffman, Assistant Professor in Penn State's Labor Studies Program. These teachers and others have constituted a Worker Education Laboratory with the Institute, to evaluate our material and to use it in their respective programs. In the future, we will work to interest a commercial publisher in reprinting it.

The Institute also intends to expand its curriculum development efforts into new areas of Social Science. Bruce Caswell, an Institute Associate, is now teaching a course on the Idea of Community in America in urban studies programs at the University of Pennsylvania and Rutgers – Camden. We intend to use this syllabus as a basis for an entire curriculum on "community" for urban studies programs throughout the country. In a similar vein, we have prepared courses for La Salle College's Communiversity on Strategies for Community Change and have helped the Philadelphia branch of the Great Lakes Colleges Association set up a three week module for their students on understanding a city's neighborhoods. Eventually, we expect to develop such programs for all social sciences, at every level of education. The way in which young people learn to think about political problems at school shapes the way in which they respond to political institutions later on. Students still demand that academic institutions take issues of value seriously. We intend to respond.

Yet our most dramatic programs relate directly to institutional and political change. Here is where we bring theorists together with labor and community leaders for discussions of important public problems. The philosophers gain from these sessions an understanding of how citizens interpret the ideas that they themselves are exploring. The leaders get an opportunity to examine the theoretical implications of issues that they face in their work. Public leaders often accuse academics of being impractical. Academics often complain that the public doesn't think. The Institute bridges this gap to the benefit of both sides by involving them in mutual explorations of questions that neither, really, can answer alone. For this reason, our projects aimed at encouraging institutional change already have had an impact. In Philadelphia, we have received wide attention for The Neighborhoods Project, which brings community activists together with scholars, organizers, and professionals to explore ways to build strong neighborhood organizations. One year following the establishment of this Project – and, in part, because of it – every Philadelphia Mayoralty candidate has made "neighborhoods" and neighborhood development a priority. In a similar vein, the Public Employees Project is exploring with leaders of the major public employee unions in Philadelphia how they can relate effectively to the community. In each case, we offer both practical and theoretical advice – how to use the press, for example, and why. Either way, we promote a respect for justice and democracy themselves.

Thus, our theoretical work, our curricula, and our public forums all aim at holding America accountable to its best principles. Through political theory, we explore the relationship between moral values and politics. Through education, we apply these theories to the crisis of modern institutions in courses for working adults. Through public forums, we bring together theorists with activists, people together with one another. We are not merely challenging the policies of a system; we are challenging the corruption of its basic ideals. Revive these, we insist, and we can transform the system itself.

G. THE INSTITUTE PAPERS

The Institute Papers provides a preliminary discussion of the basic ideas that we are examining. In each section, we offer a theoretical piece, an outline or summary of an educational program, and an article or news clipping that shows the impact of what we do. We have confined ourselves here to work developed for or by the Institute, or at least to seminar papers which the Institute Board members have used in Institute related programs. For those interested in pursuing these ideas further, we commend your attention to the brief list of suggested readings at the end of each chapter.

The theoretical work bears special attention. The essay, "The Issue is Dignity" applies the idea of dignity to the main issues of the "job satisfaction" debate about workers and the workplace. It now appears in the textbook, *Contemporary Labor Problems: The Search for Dignity*, developed by the Institute for the Union Leadership Academy. The lectures on "Community" by John Schaar and Wilson Carey McWilliams were delivered at seminars sponsored by the International Association for Cultural Freedom in Cambridge, Mass. in the spring of 1970. The Institute has used them effectively in study groups on the problem of community in modern society. The discussion of political leadership by Dennis Bathory – an Institute Associate on the political science facultly at Livingston College – is an excerpt from a book that Mr. Bathory is writing on political leadership in cooperation with the Institute. These basic documents, then, have proven effective in smaller study groups that we have sponsored thus far. We are pleased now to expose them to a wider audience.

These are *The Institute Papers*. We invite your reactions to them.

CIVIC IDEALS AND MODERN INSTITUTIONS

A Six-Session Study Group

Edward Schwartz

I. PREMISE

In increasing numbers, Americans are beginning to question whether our institutions are living up to the historic ideals of the nation. Watergate has heightened interest in this question, but the concern goes far deeper than the behavior of any one President during any one four year period. Since World War II, we have come to question the major premises of modern society itself—that abundance can buy happiness; that technological and industrial growth automatically guarantees progress. Powerful minorities have demanded a fair share of the existing wealth and power, only to discover how difficult it is for our institutions to respond to moral demands. Environmentalists now tell us that an abundance based on the destruction of the earth's natural resources will vanish before we know it. Already, we experience shortages of food and fuel, and inflation has become the major problem of all industrial nations.

How can we recover our respect for high values? How can we rebuild strong communities and institutions through which high values can be reinforced and applied? These are critical questions facing us, yet few people are trying to answer them. Modern ideologists treat values either as extentions of the private interests of conflicting groups, or as subjective consciousness concealing a materialistic dialectic of history, or as the public expression of private emotional needs. In every case, the notion of studying values as ends in themselves—as ideals which direct life, rather than merely reflect it— is ruled out. No wonder that people have lost touch with the meaning of words like "justice" or "equality" or "democracy." Where would they learn it?

The Institute for the Study of Civic Values believes that to ignore the impact of traditional ideals on everyday life is to cut oneself off from the core of human life itself. Human beings are distinguished from other animals primarily in our capacity to imagine—in our ability to construct alternatives to the world as we see it and live it. If artists can portray idealized images of the natural world, then why shouldn't citizens seek to create idealized images of the communities in which they live—and try to stick by them? American statesmen of the 18th Century didn't include words like "equality" and "justice" in our basic documents without reason. They expected these concepts to become our *modus vivendi*—our reason for existence as a people.

The six sessions we have developed, therefore, are designed to explore the relationship between civic ideals and the institutions of society today. The first three sessions explore the values first, the relationship between high values and both continuity and change in society; then the importance of common values in sustaining a political community; finally, the significance of the value of equality in permitting any common values at all in a democratic society. Sessions four through six examine the gap between these ideals and the practices of three basic American institutions—the political parties, the schools, and the churches. Our aim is not to expose institutional "hypocrisy" as an end in itself. Surely we have seen enough of that in recent years. We aim, rather, to examine what these institutions ought to be doing—and how they might do it.

In recent years, the concepts of "patriotism" and "change" have been portrayed as opposites. We

SESSION I: TRADITIONAL VALUES, PATRIOTISM, AND SOCIAL CHANGE

In recent years, the concepts of "patriotism" and "change" have been portrayed as opposites. We hear from conservatives that patriotic citizens are supposed to support the country no matter what it does. Conversely, some activists of the 60's came to feel that the only way to express their true feelings about the Indochina War was to burn the flag. Either way, the notion of loyalty to the best intentions of the nation was lost.

The essays by John Schaar and G. K. Chesterton explore the relationship between continuing principles and both patriotism and change. Schaar argues that American patriotism has always been a convenanted patriotism, demanding that citizens measure the nation in accordance with the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Chesterton demonstrates that a continuing body of ideals is critical to the legitimacy of every movement demanding institutional change. Together, they make the basic argument that the study group will explore in detail.

Questions for Discussion:

1. List as many ideas that you hold that would be considered continuing ideas – that is, that you have learned as part of the set of principles you share as an American with other citizens.

2. Which ideas embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are shared most widely today? Which ideas have had trouble surviving?

3. Can you think of areas where Americans, individually or collectively, have restrained their lust of power over one another or over other countries because of continuing civic or religious values? Would movements for change in this country since World War II been heard at all were it not for the country's presumed commitment to "liberty and justice for all?"

4. Schaar speaks of a "natural patriotism" which develops when people grow attached to where they live. Do you believe that this is a natual human tendency? Is it a good tendency? If patriotism is waning today, what is taking its place? On what basis might disenchanted Americans reclaim a sense of pride in the country?

Readings:

"The Case for Patriotism," by John Schaar, in *New American Review* #17, Bantam, pp. 59-99.

"The Eternal Revolution," from *Orthodoxy*, G. K. Chesterton, Dodd-Mead, pp. 192-214.

SESSION II: TRADITIONAL VALUES AND COMMUNITY

This session expands the argument developed in the first by emphasizing the relationship between ideals and the preservation of specific local communities. As John Schaar puts it, "political community is possible only under a couple of prior conditions, where first of all men are bound together by a common reverence for the same conception of justice and of virtue. And secondly these tables of justice and of virtue must be based in divine origin, must be hallowed by tradition, and must be enforced by the laws and the institutions." For a community to endure, moreover, it must be small enough for its members to know and identify with one another personally. The articles in this session elaborate on these basic premises.

Questions for Discussion:

1. The pieces by Schwartz, McWilliams, and Schaar aim at developing a statement of the preconditions of political community. Think of a least one situation where you have attempted to create community unsuccessfully. Which of the preconditions listed above were missing?

2. Are Schaar's preconditions for political community too demanding? Is political community possible without fulfilling all of them?

3. The selections from Plato, Rousseau, and Montesquieu all contend that genuine political community is possible only over a relatively small territory. Do you agree? If you do, do you believe that the creation of political community in the United States today is possible? If you don't, on what terms might political community be possible in the United States?

4. We talked about the importance of values in sustaining and defining specific nations in the first nation. Can high ideals like justice and equality be sustained without specific communities through which people can interpret and reinforce them?

Readings:

Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Social Contract*, Chaps. V-VIII

Unpublished Dialogue between Edward Schwartz, W. Carey McWilliams, and John Schaar on "Community." (Available through the Institute for the Study of Civic Values)

Plato, *Laws*, Book V, pp. 357-359, Loeb Classical Library

Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Social Contract*, Chapter VIII-IX

Montesquieu, *Spirit of the Laws*, p. 110 (Hafner Edition)

SESSION III: TRADITIONAL VALUES AND CIVIC EQUALITY

This session applies the premises of the first two by showing how America's historic commitment to equality has influenced movements for change throughout our history and helped define our common ideology.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Before reading G. K. Chesterton, make a brief note on what you would mean by the statement, "I'm fighting for equality." Then read the article. How close does your conception of equality come to Chesterton's? Is there any difference?

2. Chesterton discusses equality as if most Americans shared his conception of it. Do they? Who would be most likely to accept it? Who would be least likely? Who might accept it as a standard, but say that it is too difficult to achieve?

3. In what way does Chesterton try to bolster the appeal to a tradition of equality with an argument based on the natural condition of human beings? Is this a persuasive argument?

4. Try to list all the changes that would have to occur were Chesterton's conception of equality taken seriously. Is his conception of equality adequate to the changes that you would like to see?

5. Now read the speeches. Make a note of the passages where explicit appeals to civic values or civic documents are made. Are these appeals essential to the speaker's arguments – that is, does the speaker say, "We must change **because** these civic traditions demand it?" Or does he/she say, "We must change because it is right and our civic traditions demand it?" Could you remove the appeal to civic tradition without harming the speech?

6. In the speeches, what is the conception of equality discussed? In which speeches is the group asked to fight for equality in order to redress the private grievances of a dispossessed group? In which speeches does the speaker demand that a group should be included in the community of citizens? In which speeches is the appeal to equality made in order to expand or at least preserve the relative worth of a member or members of the community of citizens? In which speeches does the appeal to equality serve both purposes?

Readings:

G. K. Chesterton, "What is America," from *What I Saw In America*, in *The Man Who Was Chesterton*, Doubleday Image Books, pp. 131-135.

Speeches: *A Treasury of the World's Great Speeches*, Houston Peterson, Ed.,
Frederick Douglass, July 4th Address, July 4, 1882, p. 477.
Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Keynote, First Women's Rights Convention, p. 388
William Jennings Bryan, "Cross of Gold," July 8, 1896, p. 637
Martin Luther King, "I Have A Dream,"Aug. 28, 1963,
Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Keynote, First Women's Rights Convention, p. 388
William Jennings Bryan, "Cross of Gold," July 8, 1896, p. 637
Martin Luther King, "I Have A Dream,"Aug. 28, 1963, p. 835.

SESSION IV: CIVIC IDEALS AND POLITICAL PARTIES

Recent public opinion polls have shown that many citizens now believe that neither political party adheres to a system of ideals worthy of support. This session will examine the values fostered by each of the political parties and whether electoral politics today lives up to the historic ideals of the country as we have discussed them.

Questions for Discussion:

1. What, in general, is your reaction to Schaar's arguments for political involvement? Are they persuasive? Are they sufficient?

2. Does the debate between Roosevelt and Hoover persist in political life today, or has a new era replaced it? Is there any serious difference between the principles of the two parties in the 20's and 30's and the principles they claim to hold now?

3. Do these rhetorical debates really matter, or do politicians do pretty much the same thing when they get into office, no matter what they say they believe? If you think that there are real differences between the two major parties, be prepared to defend your thesis. If you think that both parties agree on all important matters, give evidence.

4. Does the debate between the regulars and the reformers at the turn of the century correspond to the same debate today? What are the common elements? What are the differences?

5. How would you compare the reform movements of today with the Progressive Party Platform of 1912?

6. Is either political party closer to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution than the other? Which one seems closer to you and why? Does either political party live up to your understanding of what the principles of justice, democracy, and community might require of America? Where do they fulfill these principles, and where do they fall short – if at all?

Readings:

John Schaar, "Power and Purity." in *New American Review* #19, New York, Bantam, 1974

Political Theses:

The Republican Thesis: Calvin Coolidge, "Our Heritage from Hamilton," January 11, 1922, in Albert Fried, ed., *The Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian Tradition in American Politics*, Doubleday Anchor Books, p. 370.

The National Democratic Thesis: Franklin D. Roosevelt's Commonwealth Club Speech, Sept. 23rd, 1932, in Fried, p. 401.

The Democratic Machine Thesis: "Honest Graft and Dishonest Graft," "Hold Your District and Act Accordin'," and "Ingratitude in Politics," from *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall* pp. 3-6, 25-28.

The Progressive Reform Thesis: The Progressive Party Platform of 1912, Fried, p. 337.

Political Attacks:

Republicans on Democrats: Herbert Hoover, "Dangers from Centralization and Bureaucracy," February 12, 1931, Fried, p. 395.

Democrats on Republicans: Franklin D. Roosevelt's Second Inaugural Address, June 27, 1936, in Fried, p. 448.

Democratic Regulars on Reformers: Plunkitt, "Reformers Only Mornin' Glories," and, "The Curse of Civil Service Reform," pp. 17-20, 33-36.

Reformers on Democratic Regulars: Robert M. LaFollette, "Menace of the Machine," February 22, 1897, p. 321.

SESSION V: CIVIC IDEALS AND EDUCATION

"More education," has been the country's prescription for most of its social problems. Today, however, many people are losing faith that schools can create useful citizens. What values do most schools promote? How do they relate to America's civic ideals? What kind of education would contribute to civic idealism among young people? The readings focus both on theories of moral and civic education as well as criticism of American education today.

Questions for Discussion:

1. The assumption of Plato, Rousseau, and Buber is that education must aim at developing just or virtuous citizens. Do you agree with this aim of education? Or should education aim merely at teaching people how to think critically?

2. Do you feel that schools today take seriously the pedagogical principles outlined in Rousseau's *Emile* and Buber's essay "On Education?" Do you believe these principles to be good ones?

3. One strong movement for educational reform has urged schools to liberate students from institutional restraints in order to nurture their natural creativity. Is the objective of this movement consistent or contradictory with the principles of Plato, Rousseau, and Buber? What would they say about it?

4. Would Plato, Rousseau, and Buber agree with Edgar Friedenberg about schools today? What would they advise?

Readings:

Plato, *Laws*, Book I, p. 66-67, Loeb Classical Library Edition.

Rousseau, *Emile*, Book IV, pp. 172-185, Everyman Library Edition.

Martin Buber, "On Education," from *Between Man and Man*, Macmillan, 104-117

Edgar Z. Friedenberg, "The Gifted Student and His Enemies," *The Dignity of Youth and Other Atavisms*, Random House, pp. 121-135.

SESSION VI: CIVIC IDEALS AND RELIGION

America's civic ideals have been influenced strongly by its religious heritage. Contrary to the thesis that a "Protestant Ethic" became indistinguishable from rugged individualism and capitalism, religious conviction served to restrain many citizens from pursuing power and profits at any price during periods of our history. Many movements for change, moreover, have been organized by people acting to fulfill their fundamental religious beliefs. We think of Elizabeth Cady Stanton's call to the suffragettes, or William Jennings Bryan's speeches to the Democratic Party, or the Rev. Martin Luther Kings's orations in the 1950's and 60's. What role does religious idealism play in American society? How important is it today? This session examines the general propositions and the specific role of the church and synagogue in relating religious to civic ideals.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Abraham Heschel emphasizes reverence, awe, and mystery in inculcating a sense of justice in citizens. He argues that an appreciation of God depends on these attitudes and this appreciation is essential in inculcating an ethical system consistent with God's teachings. Do you agree?

2. Do churches and synagogues today contribute to a reverence for God? For Justice? For "self-interest, rightly understood," as De Tocqueville describes it? Have churches and synagogues been able to show the relevance of their traditions to contemporary problems? If not, what should they do to revitalize themselves?

3. What is the conception of justice developed in the *Model of Christian Charity?* Does it correspond to the conception of justice that has emerged in contemporary America? Does it correspond to the conception of civic equality outlined in Chesterton's *What I Saw in America?* Do you agree with it?

4. What might substitute for God in developing a sense of justice in citizens? Can anything? Can civic idealism survive without a direct linkage to religious idealism?

Readings:

Abraham Heschel, "Religion in a Free Society," in *The Insecurity of Freedom*, Schocken Books, pp. 3-23.

Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Vintage Edition, Volume II, Part I, Chaps. 5-6; Part II, Chaps. 8-9.

John Winthrop, "A Model of Christian Charity," *The American Puritans: Their Prose and Poetry*, Doubleday Anchor Books, p. 78.

G. K. Chesterton, "The Eternal Revolution," *Orthodoxy*, pp. 214-229.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

"The Case for Patriotism", by John Schaar, *New American Review* #17, Bantam Press

Professor Schaar argues that patriotism is essential both to human fulfillment and to a coherent pattern of social change. He distinguishes between patriotism and nationalism, arguing that the former shapes higher morality, the latter merely a quest for power. He analyzes the patriotism of place felt by citizens for their birthplaces; the patriotism of the city exemplified in Pericles' *Funeral Oration*; and covenanted patriotism, that defines loyalty to a country in terms of the principles for which it stands. Covenanted patriotism, Schaar concludes, ought to be the guiding principle of patriotism in the United States.

What I Saw in America by G. K. Chesterton

Available only in libraries, this short book by Chesterton contains as succinct a statement of civic idealism in America as any that exists. Read particularly the chapter "What is America"? where Chesterton demonstrates that we need not expect everyone to become identical to believe in human equality.

Politics and Vision, by Sheldon Wolin, Little Brown

Professor Wolin analyzes the tradition of Western political philosophy from Plato through the 19th Century. His thesis is that we have replaced the classical conception of politics as the highest expression of human idealism with a notion of technological society in which the main social questions relate to organization and manipulation of masses of people. *Politics and Vision* is considered a classic in modern political thought, albeit a controversial one.

The Idea of Fraternity in America, Wilson C. McWilliams, University of California Press

Winner of the National Historical Society's Prize for the "Best Work by a New Writer" in 1973, Professor McWilliams examines the evolution of the fraternal tradition throughout American history. In the process, he gives us brilliant analysis of the Puritans, the American Enlightenment, the Jeffersonians, the Gilded Age, Modernity, and a number of important American writers. It is, by far, the most penetrating examination of American ideas of at least the past 50 years.

McCarthy and the Intellectuals, Michael Rogin, MIT Press

A devastating critique of how liberal historians and sociologists misinterpreted the American democratic tradition – specifically the Populists – in the early 1950's. The book contains a succinct analysis of the ethic of production and its defenders.

SECTION 11. DIGNITY

CONTEMPORARY LABOR PROBLEMS: EXCERPTS

Written by Edward Schwartz
Published by Union Leadership Academy

Editor's Note: The Institute's first major public program, "Work and Civic Values", brought union members, professionals, welfare recipients, and scholars together to explore new issues of work, the workplace, and the labor movement. Out of it emerged the idea that what working people demanded basically was "dignity", a sense of worth in the overall scheme of things.

Subsequently, we interested the Union Leadership Academy in letting us develop their textbook on Contemporary Labor Problems, organizing it around the idea of "dignity". The opening chapter of this text is reprinted here, as well as an outline of the rest, courtesy of the Union Leadership Academy.

INTRODUCTION

This is a course about contemporary labor problems. Yet it is more than this. It is also a course about a new way to look at contemporary labor problems. Unions, people say, fight for the self-interest of their members. That is why they organize. What is this self-interest, however? Is it money? Power? Security? The opportunity to make a meaningful contribution to society? Since we often want more than one thing, how do we choose between one interest and another? On what basis?

We offer one proposition: human self-interest is dignity, a person's worth in the overall scheme of things. Sometimes we fight for money. Sometimes we demand job security. When we see co-workers get sick because the plant is polluted, we demand enforcement of occupational safety and health laws. We want our union to be respected in society and powerful in politics. How we define these interests changes with changing conditions. The basic interest however, remains the same – the search for dignity.

Why is it important to understand that our basic self-interest is dignity? What difference does it make?

Ask yourself the following questions:

1.) If all people ever want if "bread and butter," why are some people willing to fight and die for causes – national crusades, social causes, political causes?
2.) If money buys happiness, why is there so much unrest in rich nations like the United States, while primitive tribes in Indonesia and Australia have remained unchanged for centuries?
3.) Why do people with wealth participate more in politics than people without it? Wouldn't it seem logical that poor people, people who need money, would be politically involved more than people whose economic needs have been met?
4.) Why do studies of corporate executives show that they work longer hours than many other people? With all that money, why are they killing themselves?
5.) Why do we think one political speech is more powerful than another one? Why don't we ask what the politician supports or opposes? What does "charisma" have to to with self-interest?

If you believe that all people ever want is money, then how can you answer these questions? Are all these things the "exceptions that prove the rules?" Of course not. These questions force us to consider the complexity of human needs and wants – to ask what human beings will seek under what conditions.

To understand that self-interest is dignity, then, is to understand that economic and political demands are complex. By asking, "What gives me dignity?" we can articulate things that we really want that may not now be taken seriously. By asking, "what gives people dignity," we can come to grips with movements that we can't explain in other terms. Dignity is a concept that helps us organize the events of our world into a coherent framework.

Why should we relate dignity to contemporary labor problems, however?

Because all contemporary labor problems can be seen as problems of dignity.

In sessions two and three, for example, we look to movements to organize the unorganized and to win rights for women and minorities in the workforce. We assume that the labor movement has won basic rights for millions of people – but many millions more are not covered under its umbrella. These workers, therefore, are worth less to their employers and to the society than others who are given basic protection. They want to be treated equally. They want to be treated with dignity.

In sessions 4, 5, and 6, we explore issues that working people in all strata of society are raising. How can we contribute to making work important to employers and to society itself? How can we improve the quality of our working lives? How can we better gain collective control over the work that we do? Here again, we are talking about ways in which citizens can enhance their importance – their real power over their work and in their communities. We are talking about dignity.

In sessions 7 and 8, the students must make the decisions. What are your own main priorities for improving working conditions? What steps will contribute to your sense of dignity in society as a whole? These are things you can begin to ask.

By organizing the course in this way, we cover the entire range of contemporary problems which the labor movement is confronting: unemployment, economic justice, organizing the un-organized, civil rights, ecology, occupational health and safety, "job satisfaction," workers' control, political power and change, workers' education, labor's role in society as a whole. The framework of dignity leads to these problems because these issues reflect the continuing demand for dignity. Understanding this relationship provides a coherent approach to establishing the priorities of the labor movement in the years ahead. That, ultimately, is what you will have to do.

SESSION I: THE ROOTS OF DIGNITY

A. DIGNITY AND CITIZENSHIP

Dignity is first a product of citizenship. From childhood, we ask our parents and teachers what our role in the world ought to be. The answer always depends on the specific values of the country in which we live. If we lived in the Soviet Union, for example, we would probably be told that our role was to contribute to the building of Communism, as were defined by the State and the Communist Party. Unless we were exposed to alternatives, we would soon be asking how we could live up to Marxist-Leninist ideals. Other systems – Nazi Germany, for example – have aroused citizens with a vision of military conquest. Think of all the techniques that Hitler used to persuade German citizens that their dignity depended on world domination. The results were frightening – not the least because the techniques were so effective. Some national strategies for dignity attempt to show how people can appreciate the real worth of one another; others attempt to play people off against one another. Both have worked. The problem with the second, however, is that it depends on somebody's getting hurt. The ideal system would be one in which everyone felt an inherent sense of dignity.

American ideals have based dignity upon two propositions: First, that the country respects the integrity of the **individual** to develop in his or her own way. Second, that despite differences in skills among us, we are morally and politically **equal**.

Obviously, we can think of many areas in which the country does not fulfill these ideals. We are far from achieving "liberty and justice" for all people, even though our pledge of allegiance commits us to this goal. Yet, the pledge is what makes it possible for us to fight back. Otherwise, on what basis would we feel justified in resisting? Thus, change never occurs merely in response to oppression and exploitation. If it did, there would be a revolution every week. To fight for change, people need to feel that they deserve it – that they have a right to it. Examine any effective speech demanding change, and you will find not merely a statement of specific grievances, but a list of betrayed promises or ideals. Indeed, often the grievance is that the promise or ideal has been betrayed – not merely that the speaker's group has been oppressed. In short, if our values reflect certain "self-evident" truths about individuals, our view of individuals today is shaped heavily by what the Declaration of Independence says about them. If each person fights only for equality for himself or herself, however, then how can equality become a shared value, that is, a value in the country as a whole? Who will fight for anyone else? This is the fundamental moral issue affecting the nation, around which so many labor problems revolve.

B. DIGNITY AND WORK

Understanding the idea of equality is necessary to understanding dignity in this country, but not sufficient. How do we achieve equality as workers? What are the specific demands which we make?

The following report on several sessions conducted by the Institute for the Study of Civic Values in 1974 is designed to give an overview of these questions. The main themes of the report, in fact, become topics of the chapters which follow. For the moment, however, see whether the framework helps you sort out your own demands.

THE ISSUE IS DIGNITY

Edward Schwartz
September, 1974

To anyone who went through the student movements of the 60's, the national response to unrest at the workplace is all too familiar. Ten years ago, college administrators and public leaders pulled every trick in the book to get us to shut up. First, they said that we didn't represent anybody. Then, when we began to win campus elections, they said that we were criticizing without offering specific alternatives. Then, when we did make specific demands – for more power, for new opportunities to learn how to function in politics – they said that we were violating traditional administrative (management) prerogatives.. At every point, they complained that we were too idealistic – that we had too learn how to compromise in order to get along in the "real" world. Finally, when all of these arguments failed to stop us, they put a few of us on faculty committees and sent in the police to deal with the rest.

Now the same establishment – or its counterpart in corporations – is discovering that workers are unhappy, and it's responding in the same way. For every poll that shows that unionists are getting angry, somebody commissions a poll to show that they aren't. When a union leader complains, he's asked to produce a specific list of demands. When he produces it, they say it's too expensive. Finally, in desperation, managers set up a few grievance committees, then try to freeze out all those who still aren't satisfied. They don't

call the police to deal with workers – they just lay the dissidents off.

The most pathetic part of the establishment's response is that it can't even understand why workers are complaining. The United States has the highest standard of living in the world, doesn't it? People eat better, liver better, and recreate better now than they ever did, don't they? Of course, we have problems, but we're still the best in the world – aren't we? So what's the protest about?

Workers have already developed a long list of grievances. They talk about 5.5% wage guidelines in a year when prices rose more than 10% and corporate profits skyrocketed. They speak out against speed-ups and other productivity schemes designed to push them to the breaking point. They say that the filth in the plants, the occupational health and safety violations, the daily insults from foremen and managers are driving them up the wall. A few tell reporters that they don't see any point to what they do because they don't control it. Workers who don't talk, protest in other ways – they pop pills before showing up for work or they don't show up at all.

The problem, however, is that these complaints don't hang together. Workers say so themselves. They'll list 100 complaints, but still feel that something basic is wrong that they can't describe. The result is that they're trying to find answers to problems before they've figured out the right questions. It's no wonder that when an experiment in industrial democracy or reform works, nobody knows why; and when it doesn't, the research can't explain what went wrong. Most of the experiments, good or bad, don't face up to the basic issue.

The issue, I submit, is dignity. The United States today has a lousy stratgey for dignity. I didn't reach this conclusion out of thin air. I came up with it after listening to six evening sessions sponsored by the Institute for the Study of Civic Values in Philadelphia on "Work and Civic Values." The sessions, which were sponsored by the Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania, brought together blue collar workers, welfare recipients, professionals, and students. We talked about "forced work programs" for the poor, "blue collar blues," and the politics of the labor movement. We agreed on many points, we argued about many others. Yet one point became overwhelmingly clear as the program unfolded – every single grievance that the participants raised about the workplace or their role in society had to do with dignity.

Consider, for example, the following comment from Nick Alba, a shop steward in the UAW:

> You take the run of the mill factory worker. His workplace is usually dark brown, clear. He has to stay on the job. His wages are usually middle class. He's making twelve, maybe fifteen thousand dollars a year.
>
> You have a secretary in an office. Her wages are around $6,000. She gets an hour for lunch. She's got sofas for her in the rest rooms and all this. You can't mingle with these people. We've got two classes. We may say this is a classless society, but it's not true. We do have classes, and people do adhere to those classes.

Nick admitted several times during the course of the sessions that he earned enough money – $6.00 an hour. He had no complaints about working conditions. His company had introduced every "job satisfaction" scheme in the book. What galled him was that as a blue collar worker, he was a second-class citizen, unable to mingle in "respectable" company, since middle-class people were supposed to be smarter than he was and doing more important work, no matter what the work was. The issue was dignity.

Don Dalena was another participant who had a lot to say on the subject of dignity. He had even won awards from the International Labor Press Association for his articles on the subject, written as editor of the the paper of Steelworkers' Local 4889, in Fairless Hills, Pa. To him, the problem was how workers were treated:

> When a machine breaks down – oh, boy, everyone and his uncle's around – maintenance men, top supervisors. That machine receives the best treatment possible. It's repaired. It's back on its feet. It's given the right type of oil and lubricants and grease, the right type of bearings, and it's back to normal.
>
> What happens when a worker suffers a breakdown? He's thrown in the closet as something to be ashamed of.

Blue-collar workers were worth less than machines. The issue was dignity.

Then there were the welfare recipients, engaged in an endless battle with the Pennsylvania legislature over bills to force welfare recipients to work off their pay-checks – "forced work" bills, similar to those which have passed in New York and California. Veronica Singleton, a member of the Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization, spoke for her group:

> . . . [This forced work bill] is an F.A.P.-Talmege Bill. Well, we fought that and we knocked it down. This is worse than the Family Assistance Plan (Nixon's welfare reform scheme). You should read the bill itself. The bill itself is like somebody laid down and dreamed how to keep the people in slavery, how to keep the people down. It makes me believe that the United States makes so much money out of keeping people in poverty, it's geared to putting people into poverty.

Again, although there were many issues involved with forced work, the basic issue was dignity.

So the sessions brought together people engaged in jobs, belonging to different unions and organizations, and they all ended up speaking of their grievances in the language of dignity. They didn't have a clear strategy to change their situation. They didn't always even have a clear explanation of why it existed. What they did have was a clear sense of their self-interest, and how it was being violated.

Unfortunately, not one person used the word dignity to describe this self-interest. Not one was able to express discontent in any systematic form. Even Don Dalena, who had written articles on the subject, could not translate his eloquent descriptions of worker unrest into a list of specific grievances. The participants needed a framework, a few guidelines for dignity from which they could have evaluated both their complaints about work and the various proposals to reform it. The framework might not have dictated answers; it at least would have helped them ask the right

questions. Since workers elsewhere will be planning conferences and seminars on workplace issues in their areas of the country, let me offer s sample framework here.

First – PEOPLE MUST FEEL THAT THEIR WORK IS IMPORTANT. As the participants said many times, it must be important to the company, if the workers are in private industry; or the public, if they work for the government. in both cases, employees must feel that society respects what they do. The most powerful way that an employer can show that a job means something, of course, is by paying the people who perform it adequately. An adequate wage is not always enough, however. In the Institute sessions, Don Dalena insisted that workers also had to feel that their work benefited people:

> I think that what's happened in the field of alienation is that a worker begins feeling trapped on the job after a few years. The more years he puts on this job, the more trapped he becomes. He looks back on his life and feels that he hasn't done anything with it after ten, fifteen, twenty, evey thirty years, when in essence he's done everything with it.
>
> The money's there, the money's good, but for some reason all he ever does is work. He comes home, maybe fights with his spouse and kids once in awhile, knocks down a beer, takes in a movie, becomes something else in the way of a hobbyist, but never feels that sense of worth that he is – that sense of having produced the very goods that we all depend on– everything we use in building, the cars we drive in.
>
> And this, I think, is one of the greatest failures of the trade union movement and corporate management – the failure of not instilling a sense of worth and need that workers really have.

The participants talked about other, specific indignities at the workplace. None got them angrier than the general feeling that they weren't respected by society itself.

THE WORKPLACE MUST BE LIVEABLE – A PLACE WHERE FRIENDSHIP IS POSSIBLE. This was a second requirement of dignity that the participants identified. If an employer doesn't enforce the occupational safety and health code, he or she is telling the employees that their well-being is not a concern of the company, that they don't count. If the plant looks like a slum, the workers will respond to it the way that most slum residents do – with litter under the benches and graffiti on the walls of the toilets. If the foremen treat the people on an assembly line like children, they'll fight back. One worker complained that his company wouldn't give employees a fifteen minute break in the morning, on the argument that they would turn it into a thirty minute-break. The result? "The ladies take it anyway," he said. "They just go to the ladies room and take it anyway." It was clear from his tone that the company's attitude was an insult – as if workers couldn't control themselves any better than third graders. No salary hikes were going to make up for that attitude.

Finally, WORKERS NEED POWER; WITHOUT IT, THEY AREN'T TAKEN SERIOUSLY. The participants in the sessions talked a lot about power – power to deal with management, power to deal with government, even power to deal with their own union leaders when they weren't responding to the workers' needs. Freedom was important to them primarily because it meant that they had power over a job. It told them that they were intelligent enought to perform tasks on their own time, in their own way, without somebody looking over their shoulders. To be sure, the participants could imagine places where workers had dignity wthout real power – places where management would pay them enough and treat them well. They just d'dn't believe that such places existed in the real world. Pa'ticularly in hard times, they felt at even the "good" emp loyer would try to economize at the workers' expense unless the workers were in a position to fight back.

Thus, the participants came up with three requirements for dignity – the work must be important; the workplace must be liveable; the workers must have power. Every grievance fell into one of these categories. Were workers mad that wages were frozen at 5.5% while corporate profits weren't frozen at all? They wanted to know why management deserved such special treatment. Did the participants support strikes in response to speed-ups? At some point, they said, the workplace just became unbearable – people had to fight back. Did they resent managers who introduced "job enrichment" programs into a plant without consulting the workers? Why shouldn't the workers have the power to make that kind of decision, or at least to veto it? No matter what the grievance was, the demand was the same – dignity, at the workplace and in society itself.

Is the idea of dignity useful in evaluating proposals to reform the workplace, however? The answer is a definite, "yes." Woe to the apostles of workplace reform the day that workers figure out that their real demand is dignity. Managers who say that union members always trade away better working conditions for higher pay will have to prove that every indignity has its price. Behavioral scientists who believe in ingenious "enrichment" schemes will have to tell their colleagues, and management, why workers won't mind being used as guinea pigs in their experiments. Radicals who believe that dignity is possible only if workers control the means of production will have to spell out clearly why this is so, and how a socialist system would operate in this country. Since each of these "answers" to worker unrest is getting a lot of attention, we ought to see what happens when we apply the standard of dignity to them.

The traditional management response to all workplace demands is to try to buy them off. Does a worker want improvements in health and safety conditions that might cost the company 10 million dollars? Offer a wage package that costs only 5 million dollars. Are employees demanding the right to determine work schedules? Offer a few more days paid vacation. The argument here is that the real dignity of workers depends not on their job, but on what they own, on what they can bring home. Therefore, they will always trade away a proposal to enrich the workplace for a contract which brings riches to them.

There is no doubt that this strategy often works. Not one participant in the Institute sessions was prepared to argue

that workers would give up money for working conditions easily – particularly in times of inflation. Often, workers feel that nothing can be done to make their jobs bearable, so why bother about them? Why not put up with a little extra punishment if it means that you can live that much better at home? That's where your dignity really is anyway.

If management thinks that it is serving its own interests by exploiting this attitude, however, then it should think again. The strategy assumes that workers never care about their jobs – only what they can get from them. If workers aren't supposed to care about their jobs, then why should employers complain about the other things that they do to express their apathy – staying home; taking drugs; working sloppily? Surely, these are reasonable reactions to a company which refuses to take working conditions seriously. Why should anyone take work seriously?

The participants in the Institute sessions insisted, moreover, that at some point workers do begin to care about their jobs. They care when a company introduces something so outrageous – a speed-up, for example – that no pay-hike can make up for it. They care when they don't have to trade dignity at the workplace for dignity in the family. Nick Alba said that this was the situation in his plant. They care when they begin to worry about the "basic sense of worth" in a job that Don Dalena felt was so important. Or they just care. Onah Weldon, a leader in the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers, pointed out that a central demand in a 1973 teachers' strike had had nothing to do with wages:

> Another thing we got that is really what teachers are hoping for is reduced class size. Big deal – we reduced it by two. But each time we reduce class size by one right now costs us four million dollars. We gave up eight million dollars that could have gone into our salaries, the way we negotiate – for class size. We could have taken eight million dollars and used it in our salary and fringe benefits.

In short, while bribery may work sometimes, it doesn't work all the time. Contrary to management opinion, workers aren't whores.

They aren't donkeys either. The second approach to workplace probems – ingenious "job enrichment" schemes – often assumes that they are. If wages don't keep the employees at their stations, perhaps rotating shifts, or competitive teams, or modules designed to let a group of workers produce a finished product will do the trick. The goal is never to enrich the worker or the workplace as an end in itself. The idea is to manipulate the employees into producing more.

To be sure, studies show that these experiments do work for a time, no matter what they are. It seems that anything which demonstrates a concern for the feelings of workers convinces them that they count, at least for a short period. The problem is that if they really don't count, the feeling doesn't last. Don Dalena had nothing but contempt for companies whch introduced enrichment programs without changing their basic attitudes toward the employees themselves:

> It's my contention that it isn't really what you do. It really doesn't make that much difference whether you do one part of it, or whether you assemble the entire unit – it's all in the way you're treated. I don't think it's possible to enrich a job. I don't think it's going to make the job any better if we piped in music (then the union, of course, is going to want soft music, rather than the bouncy type of music), or even if we succeed in putting mufflers on many types of things – as is required by OSHA – which is another pipe dream! At any rate, it's impossible, really, to enrich jobs. You enrich bodies, you enrich people. It's all in the way you're treated.

Every single participant in the Institute sessions agreed that if a company didn't care about its workers, nothing it could do would disguise its attitude. Since the issue was always dignity, the workers would always be able to tell.

Interestingly enough, however, despite their dissatisfaction with private industry, the participants were not convinced that public ownership would solve anything either. Some thought that it would make matters worse, by pitting workers against ordinary taxpayers rather than just a few millionaires. The difficult struggle of public employees to gain rights of collective bargaining was poweful evidence to them of the pitfalls. They didn't believe that the problems of government today were peculiar to capitalism – or that they would vanish under socialism. They thought that politicians under both systems would become corrupt – and, under public ownership, doubly powerful, because the government itself would be more powerful. Most significant, they didn't see why a dreary job would seem any better if they were doing it for the people after someone made a profit on the produce. For better or for worse, they got more dignity out of thinking that someday, they, too, might make a profit (even if they never would) than in imagining a system where profits didn't exist.

Thus, the framework of dignity sets a harsh standard for proposals for reform. Those who think that money buys everything have to start asking at what point a wage increase becomes a bribe. Reformers who favor "job enrichment" schemes have to consider why they want to introduce them – to help workers or to make the assembly line move more quickly. Radicals who believe that workers are "mystified" by capitalism have to demonstrate why socialism will offer them more dignity than the system today. Workers want to feel that they matter. They won't be "satisfied" with any solution that assumes that they really want something else, that something else is more important to them than their dignity.

The participants in the Institute sessions had a few ideas about changes that society could make to improve their sense of worth. The changes were basic. They challenged not merely the capitalist system, but any system which assumes that only intellectual work deserves respect and that only white-collar workers can be intellectuals. "Sometimes I get involved with people, and they're emphasizing college," Nick Alba complained. "College, college, college. Higher education. And there's no jobs, there's no guarantee of this. Now most of the people I know are trying to put their kids through college. They look upon management as college workers. 'I'm in a society apart from you, (they say)' 'I don't belong with you.' Like I said, the man's a failure as

soon as he comes to work." The participants, in short, were challenging the technological system – the merit system which puts college graduates at the top of a heap, and them at the bottom. They thought that they deserved credit for the system's successes, too, and they were tired of not getting it.

They were tired of blue-collar workers getting snubbed, while white collar workers and managers got power and prestige solely on the basis of their degrees. "I'm all of a sudden a second class citizen because I work with my hands," Nick Alba insisted. Geneva Harris spoke out against the educated bureaucrats who seemed to run everything:

> I've had a lots of exposure to the kinds of jobs where the degree was the thing that got you in, but it had nothing to do with your competency. I think that a lot of the lack of respect for what a person may be doing is because their job doesn't have any status while someone else's job might have status because they need a degree for it – even though what the person is doing is very meaningless.

"People put so much in status and ego today that it's unbelievable," Nick Alba concluded. "The values are lost someplace."

Don Dalena felt that the status of blue-collar workers would improve if the background of the labor movement were taught in the high schools. "We know nothing about our history," he complained. "The history of workers and the history of unions is a great history and no one's teaching it to us. We don't know a damn thing about it – what came before us; how we elevated ourselves to the status we have now, which I think is a good status." Some of the participants were already representing their unions in high school programs on the labor movement today. Yet like other dispossessed groups, they thought that the teachers and the texts had a long way to go before it gave them a fair shake.

The participants believed if workers, as adults, could gain additional educational opportunities, their status in society would rise, even if they kept their present jobs. "I think you'll find just as many workers – for example, I could go into a steel mill and I could drag you out of a steel mill sculptors and painters and poets. I don't think we have any more than any other group. But what I'm saying is that just because you're a blue-collar worker. . . (doesn't mean that you can't) appreciate a poem or a play or anything else." Mr. Dalena spoke from experience. He had attended many worker education programs himself and seen how readily most workers responded to them.

The workers thought that arbitrary division between factory and office workers would end as more service workers and government employees joined unions themselves. They saw organizing the white-collar workforce as the key to the long-range survival of the labor movement. "The clerical end is where it's at if you're going to organize," Terry Reinhold – a staff member of the Pennsylvania Social Services Union – insisted. "And if these unions want to stay alive, which means dues, you better get your ass out there and organize those people or you ain't gonna have any members."

Thus, if the blue collar workers thought that education would improve their status in society, they equally believed that unionism would show professionals what they were up against. Significantly, they pointed out that teachers were now beginning to talk about unions and unionists in classes because the teachers were becoming unionists themselves.

Ultimately, however, the participants thought that their best long-range strategy for gaining dignity in society was through politics. They understood that large corporations dominate the political system as effectively as the workplace. They realized that many politicians would listen to big business before listening to them. They knew that all the things they lacked on the job – formal education, degrees, professional training – could work against them in politics as well. Yet in politics they felt that they had numbers on their side. In politics they could demonstrate skills in organizing that schools teach. In politics the system taught that everyone was supposed to be equal – as opposed to industry, where keeping some people down indefinitely was the way the system survived. These unionists were proud of what they had accomplished on election days. They were determined to extend their political influence further:

> The AFL-CIO now – we should be leading. Instead of Ralph Nader, George Meany should have been the first one to say that the energy crisis is phony, instead of saying equal sacrifice. I don't like to hear that. But these things we can really rally around. I can guarantee you.

Thus, where industry failed, politics would succeed. Where the technical system worked against them, the democratic system would give them a chance. Even their demand for education was a demand for civic education – for education that would help them function effectively as citizens. If young people are now gaining respect through politics – if black people are – if women are – these workers were looking in the same direction.

All of this raises as many questions as it answers, of course. During the 60's, students who wanted to participate in politics asked their universities to help them. Will workers soon attempt to "politicize" the workplace as well – by demanding the right to hold political meetings in factories and offices at specified times each week? If politics represents the only meaningful alternative to talented workers, can the so-called "system" accomodate them easily? The participants rejected socialism as they knew it because of the emphasis on government control without adequate participation of people in controlling the government. If workers do begin to assert themselves politically between elections – and in large numbers – will some of their fears about public ownership disappear? Is a democratic society compatible with a technological society in any sense? Or are the values of the two hopelessly at odds? These are issues that workers and others will have to face.

For the moment, however, the Institute participants agreed on a starting point. The issue is dignity, and what we need to do to achieve it.

SECTION II: THE UNORGANIZED AND THE UNDER-REPRESENTED

Session 2: Organizing the Unorganized

This session explores the problems of bringing in organized workers into the labor movement. Why do workers want unions? How do unions contribute to their dignity? How do employers try to persuade workers that the labor movements insult their dignity?

Readings for this session include excerpts from *Labor and the American Community*, by Derek Bok and John Dunlop; *Public Workers and Public Unions*, edited by Sam Zagoria; *So Shall Ye Reap*, ("Cesar Chavez: The Organizer"), by Joan London and Harry Anderson; articles from union newspapers on the importance of the labor movement to workers.

This session explores the efforts of minorities and women to gain adequate representation within the workforce and the labor movement itself. It includes both historical and contemporary analysis of the movements, as well as documents from the movements themselves.

Readings include a speech discussing slavery delivered by Frederick Douglass, July 4, 1852; an excerpt from *The Negro Worker* by Ray Marshall; Elizabeth Cady Stanton's keynote address to the First Women's Right Convention, July 19, 1848; A Coalition of Labor Union Women Fact Sheet; a "Sex Discrimination Checklist" to rate employers by Jennifer Macleod; and reprints of newpaper stories about women in the labor movement.

SECTION III: DIGNITY – THE EMERGING ISSUES

Session 4: The Importance of Work: The Work of Importance

This session explores what workers want out of their work, what gives them satisfaction at the workplace, and how society rewards workers in a technological society.

Readings include the main documents of the "Job Satisfaction Debate," including an excerpt from the HEW report on Work in America; William Winpisinger's rebuttal from the Federationist, "Job Satisfaction: A Union Ressponse"; and an article by Don Dalena from Industry Week entitled, "A Steelworker Talks Motivation." The session concludes with an article by Robert Schrank and Susan Stein entitled, "Yearning, Learning, and Earning," that explores the impact of educational credentialing on blue collar workers.

Session 5: Making the Workplace Livable

This session explores the specific efforts to improve health, safety, and comfort of the workplace for workers. Readings include excerpts from a report on an Occupational Health and Safety Conference administered by the Center for Labor Research and Education, Berkeley, California; an article on "Choosing Your Own Work Hours" by Les Finnegan; and a study of a "job satisfaction" experiment of the Gaines Pet Food plant, Topeka, Kansas, undertaken by Robert Schrank.

Session 6: Dignity and Power

This session explores new directions in collective bargaining, workplace democracy, and union activity in politics. Readings include articles on the right to strike, multinational collective bargaining, workers' councils, blue-collar neighborhood organizing, and a report on how the trade union owns and operates its own industry in Israel. The session concludes with a debate bewteen Ronald Radosh (**American Labor and US Foreign Policy**

dosh (*American Labor and US Foreign Policy*) and Arnold Beichman (*American Federationist*, October, 1974) and on the labor movement's role in foreign policy.

SECTION IV: LABOR'S PRIORITIES IN BARGAINING AND POLITICS

Sessions 7-8: Student Presentations

In these two sessions students must make their own presentations. What are their own priorities for the labor movements in collective bargaining, and in the community, and in politics? How do these priorities improve the overall position, worth, of working people in society? How can union leaders promote a sense of pride in workers through pursuing these new objectives?

The text includes speeches and articles representing alternative priorities for the labor movement including a reading on "Shaping the Quality of Life: Let's Focus on People's Needs," I.W. Abel; Leonard Woodcock's Keynote Address to the 1974 UAW National Convention; and Jerry Wurf's Keynote Address to the 1974 AFSCME Convention.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Working, by Studs Terkel, Bantam

Widely read, *Working* portrays how citizens find dignity and cope with the indignities of their jobs. Those who want to undertake an interesting exercise on the various strategies for dignity among workers would do well to analyze the interviews here for what they tell us about how our countrymen and women achieve it.

The Hidden Injuries of Class, Richard Secnett & Johnathon Cobb, Vintage

Dignity is the unhidden theme of this book, that portrays how blue-collar workers cope with second-class citizenship in America. A superb companion to Terkel.

Invisible Man, Ralph Ellison

Although written in 1947, Ellison's novel remains a powerful, contemporary portrayal of the indignities suffered by black Americans at the hand of just about everybody. Those who seek a straightforward exposition of Ellison's views on dignity should look at *Shadow and Act*, published by Signet. We await impatiently for the author's third book, now over a decade in the making.

Black Rage, William H. Grier & Brice Cobbs, Basic Books

Two psychiatrists examine the impact of racism on black identity. They argue that the first step to eliminating mental illness among black people – even to treating it lies in recognizing its integral relationship to racist values and institutions. An absorbing examination of how yet another oppressed group achieves dignity despite the system.

Children of Crisis, Uprooted Children, et. al, Robert Coles

Where Terkel, Sennett, and Cobb examine dignity among workers; where Ellison, Grier, and Cobbs explore it among blacks, Coles analyzes it in children. Each work is a classsic in itself. The body of Coles' work is central to an understanding of dignity.

The Achieving Society, David C. McClelland, Free Press

A disturbing account of the impact of economic growth on the psychological development of citizens who pursue it. McClelland shows us how achievement has transformed the personality of traditional societies as well as our own. A classic in this genre of social criticism.

Beyond Freedom and Dignity, B. F. Skinner, Knopf

Skinner tells us that our dignity depends only on how others behave toward us. So did Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes saw this situation as leading to a war of all against all. Skinner has a solution – himself. A chilling book.

SECTION III. COMMUNITY

"OBSERVATIONS ON COMMUNITY"

John Schaar
May 1970

(Editor's Note: Between September, 1969 and May, 1970 – at the behest of the Editor – the American office of the International Association of Cultural Freedom in Cambridge, Mass. conducted six sessions on the idea of "community". The sessions were a prototype of the kind of programs that the Institute for the Study of Civic Values now sponsors in Philadelphia. Scholars, labor leaders, activists met monthly with Professors John Schaar, Wilson Carey McWilliams, and others to examine how their theories of "community" applied to the political, economic, and social crises of America today. Transcripts of the proceedings, then, were made available to the participants. The papers developed by Professors Schaar and McWilliams for these seminars were never published. The Institute has used them effectively; however, particularly in seminars with professionals involved in community work. Indeed, the Institute's Neighborhoods Project, aimed at promoting urban neighborhoods as centers of community in the cities, evolved out a study-group examining the concept of "community" presented here.

I, of course, don't know where you people have been, what kind of journeys you've had, but I thought at least I'd try to start – I know your general theme has been community – by saying a very few, very basic, almost elementary words about some of the ways that notion, that problem, that set of ideas and theories have been formulated in the tradition of Western political thought and institutions. Maybe they'll set a kind of context, a kind of boundary, provide us with a few terms when we try to talk about where we are. So this is going to be very schematic, it's even going to be stark – a kind of schematic presentation of some of the basic ways of this oldest and in our day again, liveliest of the problems of political theory. I'm not going to try to say anyting new. I'm just going to try to formulate a few themes for our talk.

I think the way the question has been mainly formulated (and it's a formulation that's appearing among us again today) is one that starts with a tension or strain between the demands of political order and structure and uniformity on the other. Today, in place after place, in writer after writer, this theme and this problem in effect is being formulated in ways that make it insoluable, that offer terms for the discussion which can end up only in paradox. It's formulated today increasingly as not merely a tension, but probably an incompatibility, between things that we call individual freedom or authenticity or self-fulfillment and self-realization on the one side, and the structures and processes of power and of domination and of alienation and mediation on the other.

Even that harsh formulation, and in the end not very useful formulation, is not new. If you start, for example, with certain of the themes in that magnificent Platonic allegory of the Cave, we're already taught that at least for certain individuals who would seek the highest possible fulfillment of their potential, it is necessary to leave the market place – to leave the life of common men and of common things, and to fix their gaze and their energies on an order of truth and reality and being which is higher, more enduring than the fleeting images of the world of opinion. And Plato tells us that once a man has tasted of that, he in effect will have to be compelled to descend again into the cave, into the market place, to shoulder some of the common burdens of ruling and of caring for the whole.

That flight, that Platonic flight from the market place – in his argument, of course, in the interest of the highest possibilities of the self, and only for the best men – is recommended today by moderns for all men. The notion of higher and of lower has virtually disappeared from the recommendation. So you can see the symbolical structure of the argument is as old as Plato, but the content and the tenor of the argument is, I think, among us today very, very different. You cut off the notion of higher and

lower and the whole thing changes. The modern consciousness contains very little of that Platonic notion that when the prepared man leaves the market place he will find authentic fulfillment not in an order created by him, but in an order discovered by him – real and existing outside of himself. Whereas for the modern, increasingly we are being told by the writers on this subject that man's only authentic and true home is the self itself. That is the only home he has, and that of course is a decisive difference. That's one way the problem has been formulated for us, that's one way of stating very starkly the change of accent that has taken place in formulating the argument.

And then there is a contending formulation of the question which is like the other one, equally old and equally new. This contending formulation, of course, found its earliest philosophical treatment in the Aristotelian vision of political life, a vision that tried to reconcile the difference between the private and the public selves – which argues that participation in the public things and cares was an essential activity in the individual quest for fulfillment or authenticity that the idiot, in effect, was not fully a man. Now that formulation finds its modern echoes, of course, in such things as the slogans of participatory democracy and in a good many books and essays. But here again there are decisive differences between the classical and modern formulations on this question which I'm going to touch on in just a minute. So then we have this one way of formulating the question – it's a formulation that asks, "can the individual participate in the structures and processes of politics and still achieve an authentic expression of the highest potentialities of the self?" We have that one common way of formulating the question and we already have those two great and opposing answers to it.

There has been, I think, a second enduring way of formulating this problem and question in political philosophy. The question is put, "Are there any conditons which are prior to and necessary for the existence of political order and community, as such? Are there then indispensable prerequisites for political community?" Here again, I want to look very, very quickly at some of the contending answers to that question. One starts again with Plato, because he has offered us an enduring answer to the question – one that still echoes in muted form and sometimes in very loud voices among us today. Usually, I suppose, if you were doing this very seriously from Plato, you would look at *The Republic*. I want to just simply instead go through the retelling of a little story in *The Protagoras*, where Plato offers us one of his earliest myths. That is, of course, his telling of the myth of Prometheus.

I won't try to expound the dialogue or anything of that sort, just retell the story very quickly. You remember it runs something like – after the creatures were created by the gods they gave to Epimetheus and to Prometheus the work of equipping each of the creatures with the materials and ability necessary to their survival. Again, as I'm sure you know, it was Epimetheus who took on the job and he loused it up. By the time he got around to man, the highest creature, he had exhausted all the materials and resources available to him. His brother Prometheus coped with the problem by that famous theft – he stole the mechanical arts and fire. He could not, however – we are told in this Platonic telling of the myth, steal political wisdom because that was held by Zeus.

Now fascinatingly, at this very early time, we're told that man is already equipped for survival. He is able to live dispersed with the arts that have been made available to him by this theft. He is able to live without the city in small and scattered and isolated groups. In this condition, then, men have the means of light, but they are too weak to defend themselves against some of the animals more furiously equipped. For, we are told by Plato, they lack the art of government, of which the art of war is a part. Therefore, they gathered into cities for their self-preservation, but lacking that art of government, they fell into conflict. Zeus, fearing the extermination of the whole race, sent his messenger to them, and here I quote: "bearing reverence and justice to be the ordering principles of cities and the bonds of friendship and conciliation." Then three other things are brought along at the same time. There is the instruction that reverence and justice must be distributed so that each man shares in them. They must not be distributed in the way the arts are, where only some can have an art and not all, for we're told that cities can exist only if all men share in the virtues and in a reverence for justice. The next thing that is brought is a God-decreed law declaring that he who has no part in reverence and justice shall be put to death as a plague of the state. The final counsel is that the state must vigorously and constantly, through every means available to it, teach men laws and teach men the meaning of justice. It must compel all men to live after the pattern furnished by the laws and justice and not to live after their own fancies and tastes.

The point is, I think, in his way of formulating the question, political community is possible only under a couple of prior conditions – where, first of all, men are bound together by a common reverence for the same conception of justice and of virtue. Secondly, these tablets of justice and of virtue must be based in divine origin, must be hallowed by tradition, and must be enforced by the laws and the institutions. Now that is such a beautiful and still timely way of making that formulation. It is as though in anticipation, Plato had looked forward to that time which is ours, when, in effect, God is dead, when tradition is either hollow, (or for those who still have it, it is seen mainly as a burden); where the law is seen increasingly as little more than temporary treaties in the struggle of competing groups for competitive advantage; and finally, where sets of beliefs held in common are said to be something called ideologies, all of which might be equally valid. Or at least, we are very confused about the status of our loyalities and our obligations to any such sets of seemingly arbitrary and relative beliefs. In short, then, we live in a world obviously without tradition and transcendence, and I'm simply trying to remind you that theorists heretofore, very powerful ones among them, have known of no way of keeping order in such a time save through force.

Now that myth and most politicial thought stemming from that time always formulated the question in terms of what did man owe the city and each other. What is so fascinating and troublesome in our time is that today, the very priorities ordinarily in most of the discussions of this subject and in most of the books on this subject have shifted so that the

primary concern is not so much with what men owe the city as it is with what each man owes himself. That is where I think typically, discussions even of this theme and topic tend to begin today. It comes as no surprise. In many ways this was the American concern, the American promise, the American commitment from the very foundling. Our central value was liberty, it was not common reverence for justice and for virtue. Liberty was defined as private liberty, namely as the liberty to enhance one's private estate and possibilities to the limits of his power. Interests and desires become the main if not the sole guides to conduct. In that profound sense, the American foundling was genuinely democratic. By calling it genuinely democratic, I mean there were to be imposed no common standards. I mean, secondly, that the test of conduct was held to be self-interest or self-expression or self-fulfillment. The context would vary. The logic would be remarkably uniform. Thirdly, I mean that all desires were to be regarded as equally valid. Desire is to be gratified in effect because it is there. I'm trying to say that it is that tendency which has now reached its perfection among us.

It's that tendency that sets, I think, the problem for our discussion. A hundred texts and movements today, even those that think they are talking about political community, stress self-liberation and self-fulfillment. They reject, in one of the common vocabularies of the day, "role-playing". Or they reject singleness of occupation and purpose. We're, I think, striving for some vulgarized version of the Marxian vision of the multiple man set forth in *The German Ideology*.

Many writers today are stressing, in effect that any institution which is not immediately responsive to personal desire and demands is without justification. That's where most of the writers are. The test of the validity of any institution is that it must directly and almost immediately contribute to the fulfillment of personal demand and desire. Of course, there's an interesting body of writers – I think they've got their own problems but they're interesting – Abraham Maslow's perhaps the most powerful of them, who try to go beyond this and provide a task. Institutions must fill basic human needs, not merely all interests and desires. The problem, however, is that the list of those basic human needs varies among the writers.

I just want to conclude by saying that nobody can say at all where this modern discovery and celebration of the self is going to lead us. I want to make a couple of points about it. First of all, nobody known to me has found that kind of integrative principle of the self upon which we can build towards all those shining and dazzling promises that are held before us today, such as authenticity, the experimental and open orientation, and so forth. I'm trying to say that it is so important to understand that after 300 years of looking for it, the self remains elusive, ironically perhaps, the most elusive thing of all, though seemingly it is the most intimate thing, the thing closest to us. Now, secondly, if that is the case, and if these impulses towards self realization are basic, then the only justification for political order and community is that they must aid in achieving self-fulfillment. That formulation I've just proposed to you probably renders the whole problem of political community odious. It probably makes it impossible to discuss the problem meaningfully. It rests, as I've said, on a very vague basis – the elusive self. Then it goes on to rest all its supreme values on the self. By doing so, I think it virtually forecloses most of the really serious questions that have to be encountered in a discussion of the problem of community.

I'll close on just one point. Just to suggest what some of the problems which are to be encountered in a serious discussion of community, I want to suggest to you a few offered by Aristotle. You remember he had a magnificent arguemnt with Plato on exactly this question. It remains, I think, the very best discussion of the matter in the whole of Western political thought. He took up the contest with Plato at exactly that point where Plato had concluded after a pwerful and beautiful argument that since unity was a good in the state the best state was the one with the most unity and the state was a perfect unity. It was exactly at that point that Aristotle enters the conversation with the proposition that the state cannot attain, and therefore should not aspire to attain unity. He thought this was so because the state consists neither of one man nor of a body of identicals. Rather it consists of a body of different kinds of men. Therefore, he tells us, community requires different kinds of capacity, interest and character among its members. It does so because through the interplay of the diversities, men, are able to serve as compliments of one another and to attain a higher and better life by the mutual exchange of different services. That's the first area of discussion for the problem of community.

That something more that I'm trying to deal with, I think, has two parts. It first of all has a part going by a number of names – fellowship, sympathy and good will tying the members of the body together, giving them a sense of common trust and responsibility. Aristotle tries to argue that this feeling must characterize the social bond just as the spirit of utility and fairness must characterize the economic bond. The fourth and final element in this presentation of the problem of community is simply justice. It is the capstone. It is found perfectly in the formulation that men form communities not just to live, but to live a life of felicity and goodness. Aristotle tries to tell us that this is what must characterize the political bond, namely the pursuit of justice and goodness, and that without this capstone all the rest is defective – sociability and fellowship become mere herding together undistinguished by any nobler purpose of gain, and the community itself becomes little more than a commercial enterprise.

In short, I'm trying to suggest that, if we really want to think seriously about the theory and the problem of community, we think of four sectors of the problem as mutual protection and material convenience. Secondly, the area of reciprocity; thirdly, fellowship and sociability; and fourthly, the agreement on felicity and justice. As nearly as I have been able to read, most of the modern formulations which start from the self will help us to talk usefully about no one of those four.

COMMUNITARIANISM VS. LIBERALISM: DOES IT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE?

By Wilson C. McWilliams, Jr.
March 28, 1970

There are distinctly liberal ideas of community, I think basically the liberal proposition is, and has been, that under liberal communitarians and under conditions of complete and thorough-going individual freedom you would find an outpouring of love that is instinctive and innate, or at least potentially present in the human spirit. In the 18th century you find a whole slew of writers – James Wilson, most prominently among Americans – the notion of a fraternal instinct which emerges when certain barriers are removed – the barriers of superstition or erroneous concepts of restraining government or (I think most typically, since the Marxian tradition) scarcity. Certainly this is the impression you get when you read the communitarian ideas of Eric Fromm.

I think you can attack this tradition in its approach to community in several ways. Within liberalism, of course, there's the attack that says essentially that the idea is nonsense, that there is no such thing as fraternal instincts, that you have to deal with a much more private kind of man. But, irrespective of the validity of the idea, it has very distinct problems. The notion of the fraternal instinct – even if one presumes such a thing exists, is both impersonal, as instincts are, and universal. It presumes that the individuals that you love or happen to feel community with are pretty much equivalent to everyone else. Any individual will do pretty much as well as anyone else. Not only does this war with the emotions of the people you're supposed to love or feel communal with – since the notion that they're absolutely dispensable is not very pleasant to human beings – but I think there's also a concealed aggression. That is, what is at stake here is the argument that any human being will do as well for me. In fact, in very fundamental terms I deny you the right to have a self. Your self is fundamentally an extension of mine so I can in fact love you equally with anybody else. It contributes in a fundamental way to my own feelings of security. If one person is removed from my environment, if I lose someone from death or desertion, I really haven't lost anything because anyone else would do just as well.

I don't know who handles the attack on the liberal community much better than D.H. Lawrence with that whole savage attack on Whitman in which he says, "the universe adds up to one, and that's Walt, and that's all there is." That's far from feeling communal because, in fact, in a genuine communal situation, you presume that there are things that are quite distinct and different about people and that there are things about which they are communal. It's not sufficient to say that we share things. I mean, we don't refer to a community of oxygen breathers – that's nonsense.

I would argue in a fundamental sense that to be a community over any period of time something has to be valued. You could speak, for example, of a community of the racially oppressed. A community of blacks is a very different thing. One can value blackness. But in so far as one doesn't value oppression, a community of the oppressed can't outlast the oppression itself. In the same way that a community of battle can't outlast the battle and never does. Those who get tied up to a community of battle, in fact, become perennially violent persons. They can't live without it.

I'm trying to suggest that one starts out with the notion of one important, uniting, valued quality. One has to distinguish it from dissonant, unimportant, different, unvalued qualities. And the presumption of almost all communitarianism though is that those different, unimportant, non-

valued qualities have to be disciplined, controlled, constrained in the interests of what is important and what is valuable.

Obviously, that's going to differ with how you define values. If you take the classical definitions of community and traditonal society, I'd argue that traditional societies emphasize the value of security in human relationships abover everything else. Most of what passes for traditional community is an effort – in some cases very desperate – to annihilate human personality, precisely because of the instability and the lack of any value beyond security and survival in such societies.

You can read 19th century stuff – the anthropology's such nonsense it's unbelievable. There's a brute mind among primitive folk. We know there is because certain societies proceed on the rule of unanimity. If yo think about it a minute, on that basis, the U.N. Security Council is characterized by a group mind. Many traditional societies essentially say something like this: either we all agree or we all agree in that we all disagree. A decision is either unanimous or it's unanimously dissident. If somebody dissents, we accepts it as a valid group decision. That's an attempt to eliminate even the privateness of one's independent decisions.

Even if you look at a more sophisticated idea or more sophisticated values – the notion of the community of scholars, to take a hackneyed, rather dull idea – you presume the presence of an important and valued quality. You do expect both encouragement for those things that are valued from members of your community, you expect discipline and discouragement from those things that are not valued. I'm thinking of Nietzche's phrase that in one's friend one finds one's best enemy.

One of the things that I think is the problem is liberal vs. communitarian thought is that the liberal image of community has essentially led us to forget the disciplining, constraining, commanding function that the community traditionally had in preliberal thought. You will still find it in Rousseau. That's one of the things that bothers liberals about Rousseau – the notion that in certain circumstances people must be forced to be free, a proposition of such transparent truth that one wonders why it's always argued within political theory classes. Everybody's had the experience of being forced to be free, of being compelled to do what they know they ought to and want to do but which they're afraid to do. But liberalism does not sit well with the notion of constraint as liberty. When you read communitarian rhetoric today very often it places no particular centrality on individual personality, on shared values beyond a very broad and vacuous area; it really has very little to say about constraint, the constraint of one's private things against public and shared and valuable.

The way liberalism in the United States has handled common things – to the extent they (liberals) can conceive of common things – the presumption has been that you somehow separate man in two ways: that man essentially behaves as a private animal, and that therefore, the disciplining function of community, to the extent that it exists, is handled mechanically, not personally.

The key to communitarian thought is that the discipline it engages is not handled by the market with checks and balances, or a countervailing power. It's handled by personal relationships with someone who says to you in ways which impinge much more directly on your own character that you shouldn't do this because you don't want to – not because you can't get away with it; not because someone will prevent you physically; but because morally you don't want to do it. In so far as I can get into your identity, I won't let you do it. . .

"THE MAYOR'S PROPOSED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROPOSAL: THE VIEW FROM THE NEIGHBORHOODS"

Bill Callahan

February 18, 1975

(Editor's Note: This was the first of six reports released by the Institute designed to promote the cause of neighborhoods in Philadelphia. The story in **The Bulletin** *appeared the night before City Council Hearings on the Block Grant plan. One week following the issuance of the report, Mayor Rizzo announced that most funds originally slated for demolition would be used for rehabilitation.)*

SUMMARY

This report was commissioned by the Neighborhoods Project several months ago, under a grant from the Max and Anna Levinson Foundation to study public issues in Philadelphia from a "neighborhoods perspective". The Neighborhoods Project of the Institute for the Study of Civic Values acts as a resource for neighborhood organizations on issues, as well as, programs that they may find useful. The Project is overseen by a Neighborhoods Task Force, composed of activists in neighborhood organizations throughout the city, many of whom also have academic or professional commitments to rebuilding and empowering neighborhood communities.

The "neighborhoods perspective" can be summarized as the belief that urban policy must be based on a commitment to strong, healthy neighborhoods. This perspective, we believe, is in strong opposition to the prevailing pattern of city policies, in which power is exercised by large, centralized economic and political institutions – banks, the business establishment, centralized government bureaucracies and political parties. From the neighborhoods perspective, the overwhelming problems of urban life – in housing, public services, education, crime, and the general "quality of life" – are at their heart symptoms of the disintegration of neighborhood communities. The first step toward solving them must be the reconstruction of those communities, and the creation of political institutions through which they become the dominant force – and the dominant issue – in Philadelphia politics.

This report is the result of three months of following the process by which the Mayor's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) proposal was put together. Neighborhood organizations played a large public role in this process. This, we believe, is an important step forward. The purpose of this report is to contribute to the dialogue that these organizations have begun; and, we hope, to help that dialogue develop into a real force for the changes that our city, and our neighborhoods, need.

In fact, the effect of the whole much-publicized "citizen participation" process on the application is extremely dubious. This raises serious questions about the future value of such a process.

There are, of course, aspects of the proposal for which neighborhood advocates will be grateful. One is the continued funding of Model Cities, which provides the application with its entire community-based health and social service components. Another is the continued funding of the Urban Renewal Project Area Committees, the only existing institutions of formal neighborhood participation in redevelopment. And there are sections of the proposal, notably housing rehab and neighborhood physical improvements, which continue and expand some of Urban Renewal's better ideas.

OVERSHADOWING ALL THESE PROBLEMS AND PROMISES, HOWEVER, IS THE PROPOSAL'S ONLY BIG NEW PROGRAM – THE ABANDONED HOUSING DEMOLITION PROGRAM. The other housing programs are extensions of programs already in operation, or start-up and pilot programs. But while there is some demolition going on, there is nothing on the scale proposed.

IN OUR JUDGMENT, THIS PROGRAM – ON THE SCALE PROPOSED AND WITH THE LACK OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONTROL NOW ENVISIONED – IS A POTENTIAL DISASTER FOR PHILADELPHIA. IT IS A DISASTER BECAUSE IT IS AN EXTENSION OF THE

DEVELOPMENT POLICIES OF THE LAST 25 YEARS – POLICIES THAT HAVE CREATED THE WORST PROBLEMS OF NEIGHBORHOODS THROUGHOUT THE CITY. IT IS A DISASTER BECAUSE IT WRITES OFF MANY NEIGHBORHOODS, THOSE WHICH HAVE THE GREATEST STAKE IN REBUILDING, AS NOT WORTH SAVING.

These are serious charges. Some neighborhood leaders may not agree with them. But they are documented in the following pages, and they are becoming increasingly obvious to a wider section of the press and public.

We hope that we can help to make these policies a subject of the widest possible debate in Philadelphia. The future of our neighborhoods may depend on it...

B. WHY THE CITY IS DEMOLISHING? IS IT NECESSARY?

Why has the city chosen to go this route? A little history: The "clearing and greening" strategy first appeared as a proposal from the department of Licenses and Inspections for $5.3 million to demolish 2,500 houses per year, with a 4 year target of 10,000. It reappeared in the Mayor's proposal as a $10.8 million project, run not by Licenses and Inspections, but by the Redevelopment Authority.

The Mayor's proposal says that "licenses and Inspections estimates that there are 10,000 to 12,000 units which require demolition". This is approximately in line with the original L & I proposal.

But where does that 12,000 figure come from? Nobody seems to know.

John Campbell, Chief of Research for Licenses and Inspections, told us that he has no idea where the figure comes from. He estimated the total of long-term vacancies at 24,000, but says there is no figure he knows of on how many must be torn down.

Rhona Zevin, the Managing Director's housing assistant, who was instrumental in writing the proposal, also had no idea where the figure came from. Probably, she said, it was taken from the L & I proposal. She told us that, at this time, only houses that have officially been declared a "public nuisance" can be demolished. She doubts that there are more than 4,000 which would meet the public nuisance criterion in the city.

In fact, an L & I study done in 1971 showed that, of 24,895 houses then vacant, only 1477 were declared public nuisances, and only 2516 (about 10%) were either public nuisances or "dilapidated" beyond repair. While the proportion may have grown since then, it seems doubtful that it has climbed to 50%. Yet that is the assumption upon which the mayor's proposal rests, publicly at least.

Did We Ask For It?

A second Administration version of the reason for all this demolition is that neighborhood groups asked for it during the hearings. Weeks made this argument to a group of neighborhood leaders shortly after the plan was announced, and Zevin repeated it to us.

There are two problems with this argument:

1.) While many groups did mention demolition in their testimony, it was virtually always in tandem with other programs – notably rehabilitation. In other words, nobody asked for simple clearance. But, as we will elaborate below, large sections of the city are targeted for just that – simple clearance. We reviewed the testimony of 16 groups wholly or partially representing these areas. (There may, of course, be a couple we missed.) Only 5 of them mentioned the advisability of some demolition, where other programs were not appropriate. Every one of the five put its primary emphasis on other programs – new construction, rehabilitation, social services, etc. The testimony of a couple of these groups is worth quoting:

Gerald Goldin, East Powelton Concerned Residents:

"We are particularly concerned by the description in this (CDBG) fact sheet...in which land acquisition and clearance is stated as one of the primary purposes for the use of these funds.

"We don't want to see land acquisition and clearance so that private institutions and profit-making institutions can expand into our residential community."

Claire Braun, Northern Liberties Civic Association:

"We are concerned with the demolition of lovely old certifiable homes.."

Sondra Williams, North Central Community Organization:

"The restoration of Penn District will also require selected demolition **as directed by area residents**..." (our emphasis)

Of the 16 groups from the demolition-only areas, 2/3 failed to mention demolition in their testimony at the public hearing. Queen Village Neighbors asked for a long list of neighborhood improvements; Hartranft Community Corporation asked for grants and loans plus vacant house rehab; the Mill Creek Community Center requested recreation facilities and the building up of 30-40 previously cleared acres; and so on.

In the light of these facts, it is hard to argue that the Mayor's Office designed its demolition program – 1/5 of the CDBG budget, 1/2 of the Housing money in CDBG, and more than the money set aside for all rehab programs – in response to a groundswell from the communities most concerned. These communities either didn't mention demolition, put it fairly far down on their list of priorities, or specified community selection of sites (not a part of the Mayor's plan).

C. THE NEED FOR NEIGHBORHOOD CONTROL

Finally, neighborhoods should be aware that the city, in setting out these housing and housing destruction programs, has no specific plans for where to put them. Furthermore, there are only the vaguest mechanisms for making such decisions. Unless steps are taken to change this, the implementing agencies – the Redevelopment Authority and the City departments – will continue to decide the fates of neighborhoods.

Weeks has publicly mentioned an inter-agency board to make decisions on demolition. What role will neighborhoods be allowed to play in these decisions? So far, only one role is indicated, the usual one: Go to City Hall and deal.

As regards the other programs (rehab grants and loans, block-building, etc.) as well as associated neighborhood improvement programs like site improvement and recreation rehab, a vacuum exists. Those programs which are already in operation in Urban Renewal areas probably will go on in the same way, with decisions made ultimately by the Redevelopment Authority, advised by the Project Area Committees. But what about other areas?

Rhona Zevin indicated to us that she would like to see these programs (along with demolition) used in selected target areas, similar to Urban Renewal areas. She also indicated that the means for picking these areas and implementing the programs remain to be worked out; that they will probably involved various agencies, with the possibility of some form of citizen participation.

All this is not good enough. The demolition program poses the gravest threat to many neighborhoods; other CDBG programs present limited opportunities. But the forces of neighborhood destruction have already proven their strength in the construction of this proposal. Neighborhoods need more than inter-agency negotiations or informal consultations in the decisions that will determine their futures.

One proposal, little discussed up to now, underscores this need. The proposal includes $100,000 to set up a quasi-public corporation to manage a "mortgage and Loan Guarantee Program". This is start-up money; it willl have no concrete effects this year. But the corporation, and presumably its governing rules, will be set up this year. The corporation's role, according to Zevin, may eventually extend to taking over banks' whole mortgage portfolios in certain neighborhoods. Where? Who will decide? In the long run, these may be the most important questions raised by the proposal. They are far too important to be decided by the bureaucrats and bankers who have taken us this far.

NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS NEED AN EXPLICIT, FORMAL ROLE IN THESE DECISIONS. NEIGHBORHOODS MUST HAVE AN ABSOLUTE VETO OVER DEMOLITIONS IN THEIR OWN AREAS; REAL POWER IN OTHER DECISIONS AFFECTING THEIR ACCESS TO REHAB AND SIMILAR PROGRAMS; AND A CONTI - UING, POWERFUL VOICE IN THE DESIGN OF FUTURE PROGRAMS.

The "Housing Plan" deveoped by the City over the last three months reflects little real input from the neighborhoods, despite the display of citizen participation it involved. As a result, it adds little to the neighborhoods' prospects for survival, and it threatens much. It is, to an unfortunate extent, a plan for destroying neighborhoods. After this experience, neighborhood organizations should have learned about the limitations of "citizen participation". It is time to start talking about Neighborhood Power!

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

The Idea of Fraternity in America, Wilson C. McWilliams, University of California

Described elsewhere (see "Civic Idealism"), *Fraternity* is the single, best study to read. Examine particularly the first four chapters, where McWilliams' basic theory of fraternity is developed.

The Philosophy of Loyalty or The Philosophy of Josiah Royce, Josiah Royce, (Edited by John K. Roth) Appolo

The Philosophy of Josiah Royce includes much of *Loyalty*, which is the pertinent work. In it, Royce argues that "loyalty" is the value that mediates between the individual and society and that everyone ought to promote "loyalty to loyalty" as a public virtue. This latter idea is a bit strained, but the discussion of loyalty itself is incisive and entertaining.

Reveille for Radicals, Saul Alinsky, Vintage

Alinsky's classic text on community organizing, we consider it superior to *Rules for Radicals* written twenty-five years later. Particularly interesting is Alinsky's discussion of how community values relate to building strong neighborhood organizations – and his introduction, written in the 60's descrying the breakdown of local institutions in America.

The Private City, Sam Bass Warner, Jr., University of Pennsylvania Press

Sam Bass Warner, Jr.'s book has wide acclaim not merely as a study of privatism and Philadelphia, but as a study of private values and urbanism in general. His alternative emphasizes more the need for collective planning than neighborhood organizations, but the discussion of "the private city" is valuable in itself.

The Meaning of the City, Jacques Ellul, Eerdmans Press

Ellul examines the Biblical perspective on cities with devastating effect. He points out that thousands of years before modern cities, the Old Testament warned that they would become centers of corruption. The first City, in fact, was created by Cain as a human fortress for those denied the protection of God. A brilliant interweaving of theology and sociology.

SECTION IV. PARTICIPATION

POLITICAL LEADERSHIP: A COMMON SEARCH FOR THE POSSIBLE

Dennis Bathory

(Editor's Note: This is excerpted from a forthcoming book on Political Leadership)

Ours is an "age of hyperbole", argued a recent commentator, an age that moves all too easily from visions of the "heavenly city" to visions of the "apolcalypse". We must, insists another author move "beyond hope and despair" avoiding the false prophecies of both. Each man laments our tendency to exaggerate and dramatize whatever we experience. Both insist that this tendency leads inevitably to frustration – frustration of citizens and leaders alike. The cycles of hope and despair of the last fifteen years surely indicate the good common sense underlying these and others' analyses. Still, we find ourselves with no easy response to their warnings. Where do we turn? What does a world beyond hope and despair look like?

The wild fluctuations of the sixties – the promises of New Frontiers and Great Societies, the spectre of civil strife and global conflict – were if nothing else exhausting. In this state of exhaustion it is easy to be cynical about promises of any sort; but it is also easy to be cynical about prophecies of doom. Enervated by the spectacle of Watergate, humiliated by defeat and withdrawal in Vietnam, many will find the temptation to escape from public commitment of any kind all the greater. It may be that this world – one that is also beyond hope and despair – is that which we most have to fear. Alexis de Tocqueville worried about one such vision of retreat when he spoke of a democratic despotism "more extensive and more mild (which) would degrade men without tormenting them". Philip Slater has more recently spoken of our "pursuit of loneliness" with many of the same concerns. The problem is clearly to energize people without creating mania, to make them aware of human limitation and imperfection without creating depression and withdrawal.

Political leaders are facing this problem in great numbers now, and are raising many important questions. The questions have been the classic questions of political science. What "issues" are to be raised for political leaders? How are they to be raised? When? Where? By whom? Classic questions they are. Perhaps, however, they are too difficult for us to handle yet. Hyperbole, after all, can be an understandable response to questions poorly or incompletely phrased. It may be that more fundamental, even simpler questions have to be asked first. The need to examine the nature of our political leadership is clear. The terms in which that examination is to be carried out are much less clear. We must again ask basic questions and rediscover the language that will make possible the public search for answers. We must think more clearly about what a leader is and can be in a democracy. How is the leader to be judged? By what standards? In what political cultural and historical context? This is, of course, to reopen very old questions. To suggest that they are old is not, however, to suggest that they are inappropriate to our own study; nor can it be maintained that they have been answered adequately for our age any more than they were for our ancestors. Earlier generation of Americans understood readily the impossibility of absolute answers to these questions and were less frustrated with limitations and imperfection for granted. They knew that such questions were and had to remain preliminary questions. Insofar as they were not asked, the judgment of all – citizen, leader and scholar – would be limited.

Founding Principles and the Study of Political Leadership

That great defender of democracy, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, insisted that it was his duty, born into a free state as he was, to study and learn the nature of public affairs, however small his influence might be. It was, he continued, his duty as a citizen, not as a leader, not as an intellectual, but as one who had the right to exercise his vote, to know about the nature of public life. In order to gain such knowledge, however, it was necessary, to look beyond the day-to-day functioning of government, beyond the structures and processes through which people "muddled through" their "shared" problems. The task he set for himself was to discover the very foundation of social life. How were shared dilemmas identified in the first place? How were

societies founded? How could founding, binding principles be sustained, sustained in the midst of a constant pressure for individual power which threatened the social whole? These were Rousseau's questions, or least a significant group of them.

His search for answers to them did not lead to a textbook for the democratic leader, nor to a set of universal principles through which to judge the success of a democratic system. On the contrary, he insisted that any leader must begin with a clear understanding of both the character and the situation of the particular people to be organized. Circumstances and character vary. The leader's real task was to adapt to both. He had to create that "public vision" from which "comes union of understanding and of will in the body of society: from which union flows the due cooperation of parts, and finally, the strength of the whole in its maximum manifestation". To sustain such a vision and the unity that accompanies it, Rousseau knew required continuing perseverance. His own commitment to study the nature of politics had to be undertaken by all if a democratic policy were to be sustained. What mattered was not the development of a set of absolute, universally applicable principles, but rather a constant search for answers to fundamental questions. It was that constant search which kept alive "public vision" and so the possibility of "cooperation".

We have much to learn from Rousseau. Not because he enunciated principles as applicable to our age as they were to his, but because he insisted that in order to discover what a democratic people have in common we must examine carefully what specific people, in fact, share. But, he insisted, this would be an arduous task, for it was all too easy for a ruling elite to present an appearance of unity which, in fact, was in the service of private interests. If appearance masked reality, then it was the responsibility of the people to go behind appearance and seek, insofar as it existed, the basis of a truer unity. Insofar as we are increasingly dominated by "appearance" and manufactured "images" today, it may be that such a search has become too difficult, but, then, those who would understand the possibilities for democratic leadership must realize this as well. Rousseau was, after all, far from optimistic about the future of democracy. We may have as much to learn from his "realism" as we do from his "romanticism", from his sense of the limitations of human nature and democratic politics as well as the possibilities.

Nineteenth century liberalism, wed to technology and promises of unending growth, created expectations about material and human potential that would have made our ancestors blush, it also complicated the task of the democratic political leader in ways that would have made them turn away from political responsibility in horror. Exaggeration is easy in our world. Excitement is generated quickly and frustration grown geometrically. The palpable reality of this political manic-depression cycle is present for all to examine. The problem is to formulate a coherent set of reasons why the examination is worthwhile. False expectations may be the result of more than false promises. They may also be raised through establishing categories for examining the political system that ignores its major problems.

Our public vocabulary – political rhetoric and analysis alike – is dominated by a series of words and phrases that seem to offer a starting point for such an examination. Phrases with partisan or ideological connotations like "law and order", or "military-industrial complex" or "credibility gap" evoke responses, bred through regular use, which seem to offer student, citizen and leader a shorthand insight into the political system, but these can mask it equally well. Words like "conspiracy" or "legitimacy" or "censorship" are readily found in the phrases of political commentators and the rhetoric of political leaders. They set off immediate responses in many listeners, but seldom with much perceptible substantive political content. To recognize that there are many such words and phrases is to come to grips with the critical dilemma that our public vocabulary poses for us all.

Three particular notions in vogue for the last fifteen years deserve special comment – consensus, corruption and charisma. Each has been important to both analyst and leader, each is familiar to the citizen. They share the more general problem of much of public vocabulary in their imprecision; or, perhaps better, illusory precision. In addition, however, they share among themselves certain other characteristics that underline some of the most critical problems facing the contemporary democratic leader, there is an absolutist quality to each of these three words that is both striking and troublesome.

(1) Consensus, hiding under the guise of the all inclusive compromise, demands that we stifle conflict and opposition. Those who proclaim its virtues have often failed to realize the historical and conceptual dilemmas that accompany such pleas for harmony and unity. Michael Rogin reminds us that the original American "consensus" was based upon a Lockean vision of rural unity that was "splintered as the country urbanized and industrialized, as it filled with new immigrants and bureaucracies." To be sure, as new groups emerged, cries for "legitimate conflict within consensus" re-emerged but the substance of the new consensus became increasingly unclear. In fact, however important the acceptance of diversity and conflicting interests has been to the development of the American Policy, it is clear – as Rogin, again, points out – that these realities have not been "the rallying cry of political debate." In the day to day process of winning adherents and discrediting opponents, appeals to the people against "vested interests" or against "outside agitators" are more effective. If in this process, the possibility of serious differences of opinion are dismissed, the possibility of an open discussion of goals is correspondingly diminished. The reality of such differences must remain unexamined when the rhetoric of consensus dominates.

(2) Gossip column fascination with corruption may be understandable; but again, frequent exposure to the speculations of muckrakers (like exposure to consensus-mongers) can produce unintended consequences. It is not merely the frustration and cynicism produced by constant criticism that democracy has to fear. The expectations of citizens encouraged to focus exclusively on corruption can be even more devastating.

To begin to define the "public interest" as the opposite of corruption is to establish a standard of civic virtue which is at once vague and unattainable. Frustration, despair and withdrawal challenge the foundations of democracy as directly as Plunkitt's "dishonest graft".

To be sure, talk of corruption is not new to this country. It is at least as old as the 18th century when talk of corruption dominated much of the colonists' anti-British sentiments. Their discussion, however, avoided both dilemmas of contemporary analysis. Colonial pamphleteers and ministers, as would Alexis de Tocqueville later, found cynicism

in the face of corruption cynical in itself. A cynical retreat in the face of corruption was for these people self-condemnation – an admission of weakness, their own and the society's. It represented an abdication of public responsibility. As DeTocqueville suggested, when power and corruption are equated, public standards of judgement disappear and an atmosphere in which corruption flourishes is enhanced. Though fear of corruption was great in both pre and post revolutionary America, it seldom became the standard against which leaders or their ideas were judged. However vague and even conflicting then, positive ideas of public virtue may have been, they provided the standards of judgement. Our ancestors would have thought our treatment of this problem to be a reversal of classical wisdom. Corruption was for them viewed as the absence of public virtue. Our inclination to define public virtue as the absence of corruption would have seemed strange and unwise to them.

(3) Finally, the use of the word charisma seems to generate (even in Weber's own categories) an extreme and polarized view of politics and political leadership. The "opposite" of the charismatic personality is, after all, the commonplace, routinized bureaucrat. The absence of the former would seem to leave room for nothing but the latter.

Cynicism and doubt about the utility of the word charisma notwithstanding, we seem to be stuck with it. Charisma, whatever its contemporary meaning, is not as fleeting as the false promises that so often accompany it. We forget the inadequacies of a "charismatic" hero far more quickly than we remember the successes of less "attractive" leaders. Perhaps human nature with the assistance of contemporary media makes this situation inevitable. Still, the dominant place that the media must have in creating contemporary heroes is itself symptomatic of a problem. Primary concern for "image" leads quickly to a search for a saviour that contains no conception of salvation itself. In a cruel inversion of Platonic wisdom, political identity is created through identification with the hero. There is no obligation to know oneself nor to know one's neighbor. Political action becomes the "action" of the leader; or perhaps better, the adrenalin that flows in response to the leader's image. Nonetheless, the temptation to escape from commitment matters. Romantic images of saviors will continue to be compelling as long as this is the case.

The illusory precision of words like these is only part of the problem generated by our public vocabulary. The unstated, but nonetheless exaggerated and extreme vision of politics and political leadership implicit in each is just as significant. Our words betray our public spirit. As we have lost a clear sense of ourselves as part of the public arena, we have lost a sense of the limitations which both collective action and human nature impose. We have come to expect either too much or too little and have lost excitement about a common search for the possible.

We would again do well to take the words of James MacGregor Burns seriously, in *The Lion and the Fox*, that we accept the limitations on even the most creative leadership and recognize that the leader brings about lasting change not by intervening sporadically and casually in the stream of events, but only by altering , if he can, the channels in which the stream of events takes place." Such leadership will clearly require more than the superficial analysis that is reflected in most popular discourse. To accept the "limitations" of which Burns speaks is, after all, to accept the necessity of a thoroughgoing examination of democratic values and the interaction between them.

His is not a plea for new categories, new boxes which describe new traits of new or old leaders. It is instead, a plea for a return to simplicity, a plea that has not been heeded. What has been lost is indeed a sense of the "possible": What is possible in human terms? What can a leader be expected to do? What can the people do? What is possible in structural terms? What are the constraints of size and complexity? How do they affect leaders and followers? These are Rousseau's questions as well. The suggestion here is that they must be addressed if the mandate to make a significant contribution to the defense and development of democratic value is to be met.

A plea for simplicity is more than a plea for the revival of a discussion of democratic values. The re-introduction of a sense of the possible can allow the student of leadership a new perspective from which to view what a leader has done and can do. We can recognize again that an analysis of democratic values is central to an understanding of democratic politics. Likewise, a simpler and more frank discussion of human and political possibility can shape expectations of citizens – expectations about themselves and their leaders – in a more reasonable fashion. It can help them avoid both pessimistic and optimistic hyperbole and permit discussion of democratic values that is based on something more than negativisms and moralisms. Finally, for the potentially "creative leader", a search for answers to these questions is mandatory. The leader, after all, requires for his action an atmosphere in which citizens are willing to seek guidance, even as they seek opportunities for collective action. For a contemporary democratic leader to inspire such confidence and simultaneously encourage public action is difficult enough. The task is rendered impossible without a common vocabularly through which citizen, leader and scholar can analyze and judge their common problems.

PROMOTING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

INTRODUCTION

The Institute promotes civic participation in three ways: First, we involve labor and community leaders in public forums on issues that make them aware of alternative perspectives and strategies for change; Second, we bring citizens together with public officials to examine whether government is responding to the needs of the people; Third, we aid neighborhood, labor, and civic organizations in gaining the practical skills needed to organize effectively for change.

The materials in this section describe our most successful programs to date.

THE FUTURE OF PHILADELPHIA

Between March 19th and April 23, 1975, the Institute sponsored three simultaneous series on issues related to the Future of Philadelphia. The program was made possible by a grant from the Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania.

The first series involved leaders of local public employee unions in discussions of "Public Employees in Philadelphia's Future". The second brought workers from Knit Goods Local 190, the International Union of Electrical Workers, and Amalgamated Clothing Workers together to discuss "The Economic Crisis and the Future of Philadelphia". The third enabled neighborhood activists and leaders to explore the problem of "Neighborhoods: How Do We Get Power?" The program concluded with a Town Meeting on the Future of Philadelphia that brought these three seminars together.

The Institute will be sponsoring similar public forums in 1975-76, on topics related to the National Endowment for the Humanities' series, the American Issues Forum, Grants from the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission and the William Penn Foundation make possible this expanded community-labor education program.

The programs below suggest the various ways that we help citizens confront the complex issues that face them.

I. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES IN PHILADELPHIA'S FUTURE

SESSION I, MARCH 19th:
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES: THE COMMON INTEREST

Edward Schwartz, President, Institute for the Study of Civic Values, Moderator.

QUESTIONS

The premise of the discussion will be that a worker's basic self-interest is dignity, his or her sense of worth on the job and in the community. Adequate pay, decent working conditions, control over the work may be strategies to achieve dignity, but dignity is the basic goal which all specific demands are trying to reach.

Three conditions must prevail:

1) The work must be considered important.

2) The workplace must be liveable.

3) The workers must have power.

Consider each of these principles, then as the following questions:

1) What, specifically, achieves each objective at your workplace? In which area are workers in your agency or office department weakest?

2) Which of the three principles is most important to you? Why? Which is least important?

3) In making contract demands, which of the three principles is emphasized most? In what way? Why? Which of the three principles is emphasized least?

4) In arguing for specific demands with employers and the public, are you conscious that dignity is the basic issue? On what basis do you defend your demands? On what basis do you have to defend yourselves against the claims of others?

5) Which demands that you feel are important are common to all unions? Which are common to public employee unions that distinguish them from other unions? Which are peculiar to your own union?

6) Is "dignity" a useful way to look at self-interest, or is there a better way? How does your union evaluate its basic interests now?

SESSION II, MARCH 26th: THE VIEW FROM THE WORKPLACE

Presentation: Dr. Larry Spence, Dept. of Political Science, Penn State University

QUESTIONS

Dr. Spence will report on the results of a study of welfare workers' attitudes in Pennsylvania. In evaluating this report, consider the following:

1) What similarities in the treatment of welfare workers do you see in the treatment of employees at your workplace? What differences are there?

2) Dr. Spence emphasizes the lack of communication between workers and administrators in the welfare department. Is there an equivalent lack of communication where you work? If not, what prevents it? If there is, what are the consequences?

3) Welfare workers are often blamed for the break down in a system which many of them feel is not able to accomplish its stated goal – namely, to help those who cannot help themselves. Does your agency accomplish its stated goal? If and when it doesn't, who is blamed – the administration or the workers or both?

4) Is your own situation better or worse than that of the welfare workers? Why?

5) What should the workers in the welfare department be demanding to achieve dignity in their work? What are they demanding?

SESSION III, APRIL 3rd: PUBLIC EMPLOYEES AND PUBLIC FINANCE

Presentation: Mr. Leo Rosen, Chief, Operating Budget, City of Philadelphia

QUESTIONS

Mr. Rosen will present a straightforward assessment of Philadelphia's fiscal prospects over the next three or four years, particularly as they might affect public employees. In light of his presentation and related developments, consider the following:

1) How carefully does your union examine budgets related to your own job or jobs? How carefully does it consider fiscal matters in general? During an election, does it interpret promises of specific candidates in light of the needs of union members?

2) What efforts does your union make in fighting to expand the budget of your department or service? Does it join with management in appeals to City Council, the State Legislature, or Congress? Should it?

3) Since tax dollars pay for your service, should your union be in the forefront of campaigns for tax reform? Is it? Why or Why not?

4) Public employee unions in other cities have been asked to accept pay cuts in order to prevent lay-offs. What do you think your union ought to do if a similar situation arose in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, or in federal employment? What is it likely to do?

SESSION IV, APRIL 9th: PUBLIC EMPLOYEES AND THE COMMUNITY

Presentation: Happy Fernandez, President, Parents Union

QUESTIONS

The Parents Union has initiated a suit against the School District for permitting the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers to review all hiring and firing decisions and transfer decisions within the public schools. The parents claim that this contract provision makes public control of educational policy impossible. The issue raised gets at the heart of the conflict between the claims of some community organizations and the claims of public employees.

In evaluating Ms. Fernandez presentation, consider the following:

1) What should the responsibility of public employees and public employee unions be to the public in general?

2) What specific responsibilities, if any, does the public employee union have toward the clients or consumers of the service that the workers deliver?

3) What responsibility should public employees take for fighting for improvements in the quality of the services offered by their respective agencies?

4) What is the response of your own union to demands for tighter community or public control over your service or institution? Do you feel that the community understands your situation? What could improve its understanding?

SESSION V, APRIL 23rd: PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, THE PRESS AND THE PUBLIC

Presentations: Mr. Rolfe Neill, Editor, *Daily News*
Mr. Max King, City Editor, *Philadelphia Inquirer*
Mr. William Marimow, Labor Reporter, *Philadelphia Inquirer*

QUESTIONS

The presentations will emphasize the problems of reporting labor-management conflicts in general, and public employee

unions in particular. In evaluating the presentations, consider the following:

1) What efforts does your union make to cultivate the press? Is there a press officer or public relations director in your union? Does the Union President know the labor reporters on the daily papers?

2) Has your union received fair or unfair coverage in the press? On what do you base your claim?

3) If you feel that press coverage of your union has been unfair, what do you think is the reason?

a) Inexperienced reporters

b) Editors always take management's point of view

c) The editors are against us and it comes out in the news pages

d) The newspaper readers wouldn't stand for honest coverage of our strikes, because they don't like them. The newspapers merely reflect what the public wants.

4) What could the press do to improve coverage of public employee unions?

5) What could public employee unions do to improve relations with the press?

SESSION VI, APRIL 30th: PUBLIC EMPLOYEES – TOWARD COOPERATION

Presentation: Alice Hoffman, Department of Labor Studies, Penn State University

QUESTIONS

Ms. Hoffman will provide background on how other cooperative bodies and councils of unions have developed. In light of her presentation and in light of discussions thus far, consider the following:

1) Should public employee unions in Philadelphia create a council or committee to represent common interests and cope with matters of mutual concern? What form should it take – a committee of the Philadelphia AFL-CIO? A committee of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO? A council, like the Building Trades Council? None of the preceding?

2) What are the main arguments for a common structure? What are the main arguments against it?

3) What purposes might a common structure serve? What should it stay out of?

4) What are the main obstacles to creating a public sector council now? Can these be overcome? Should they be?

II. JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

A. Summary of the Program

The project brought employed and unemployed union members from the I.U.E. Knit Goods Local 190 and Amalgamated Clothing Workers for seminars on the crisis of jobs and the economy. The sessions were as follows:

March 19th – What's Going On?

A panel of experts from the AFL-CIO's Human Resources Development Institute, the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Housing Association of Delaware Valley describes various symptoms of the economic crisis in Philadelphia and various participants describe the unemployment situation in their industries.

March 26 – The Crisis in Philadelphia

Bill Callahan, coordinator, and Don Kennedy, Labor Historian, Penn State Labor Studies Department, lead a discussion of the underlying economic causes of the crisis, aimed at understanding the impacts of various programs for recovery – proposals by the Ford Admininstration, the AFL-CIO and others.

April 2 – Economic Crisis and Economic Justice

Dr. John Raines, Religion Department, Temple University, leads a discussion of the ways in which income and wealth are distributed among American families and how this distribution underlines our perceptions of fairness and justice in economic programs – and how it determines who is hurt by the economic crisis.

April 9 – Who's in Charge Here (Part I)

A Vice President of the First Pennsylvania Bank makes a presentation and discusses with participants how the causes and cures of inflation/recession look to the business community.

April 16 – Who's in Charge Here (Part II)

Dr. John Raines, Temple University, and Bill Callahan, lead a discussion of the political obstacles to economic change from the ordinary unionist's point of view – focusing on the participant's feelings of political powerlessness, the relationship between power and wealth, and unions as instruments for change.

April 23 – Doing Something About It

Don Kennedy, Penn State Labor Studies, leads the wrap-up session which reviews the previous discussion and formulated questions and suggestions for the future.

III. "NEIGHBORHOODS: HOW DO WE GET POWER?"

Wednesday, March 19: WHAT IS A NEIGHBORHOOD?

Wilson Carey McWilliams, Professor of Political Science, Rutgers University

The subject of this discussion is the neighborhood itself. The general question to be raised is whether the neighborhoods is the right place to be building organization. Why do people live in the neighborhoods they live in? What kinds of changes in city policy (housing policy, recreation, etc.) would be needed to make people stay in your community if they could afford to move out? What positive value does the neighborhood hold for people?

We will touch on, in briefer form, most of the issues that will be discussed later with representatives from the city and other institutions. This session will serve as an introduction to the whole series.

Wednesday, March 26: HISTORY OF PHILADELPHIA'S NEIGHBORHOODS

Vera Gunn, Heritage House; Richard Juliani, Sociologist Temple University

Philadelphia has a long history of ethnic neighborhoods, formed by different groups. This session will focus on the ways that neighborhoods have been held together as communities in the past. We will also discuss how neighborhoods in which several different groups live can become communities. These neighborhoods often present special problems for people trying to build community organizations in them.

Wednesday, April 2: RECYCLING PHILADELPHIA'S NEIGHBORHOODS?

John Higgins, Chief of Area Planning, City Planning Commision,
Augustine Salvitti, Ex. Director, Redevelopment Authority;
Conrad Weiler, Political Scientist, Temple University

Recent developments over community development funds have suggested to many people that the City of Philadelphia has a deliberate policy of "recycling" many of our neighborhoods, that is, deliberately allowing certain neighborhoods to deteriorate, and then claiming they cannot be saved and embarking on massive demolition programs. Meanwhile, the people of the neighborhoods are forced to move to other sections of the city, causing problems of overcrowding and often facing the same reduction in city services. Finally, middle and upper class people will be lured back from the suburbs, to live in newly created upper income neighborhoods built from the cleared land. Is this really city policy.

This session will discuss these and other related issues. We hope to arrive at some understanding of exactly what the planners have planned for our neighborhoods, and why. This will be an opportunity to confront city officials with some basic questions, and hear what they have to say.

Wednesday, April 9: BANKS, BUSINESS, AND NEIGHBORHOODS

Louis Bell, President, Hamilton Reliance Savings and Loan
Philip Price, Director Allegheny West Project
Vincent Quayle, S.J., St. Ambrose Housing Center, Baltimore

When a bank won't give mortgages in a neighborhood, the neighborhood begins to deteriorate. People cannot sell their houses, and are forced to abandon them. Families who want to move in to the neighborhood cannot find a house they can buy with a mortgage, so go elsewhere. This practice, known as redlining, is rumored to be in effect over more than half of Philadelphia.

Mr. Bell, as a bank president, will discuss mortgage policies with us. We can ask him why his bank and other banks refuse to give mortgages in our communities. People in other parts of the country have waged successful struggles against redlining practices. One of these places is Baltimore, and Vincent Quayle will be able to tell us about their experience.

When an industry leaves a neighborhood, it also often leads to deterioration. Tastykake, faced with that choice in North Philadelphia, decided to stay. They set up the Allegheny West Foundation, which has been rehabilitating housing in the area around the Tastykake plant. Philip Price will tell us about their experience, and offer advice on how community groups could encourage similar projects with industries in other parts of the city.

Wednesday, April 16: SCHOOLS AND THE COMMUNITY

Dr. Richard Hanusey, Superintendent, District 5, School District of Philadelphia
Mrs. Mary Rouse, Kensington Self Help Center
Sister Barbara Regina, Parochial School System

Neighborhood schools are an increasing source of concern in many communities. How valuable are public neighborhood schools in building neighborhood cohesion? This panel, to be chaired by Mary Hardwick from the Miquon Upper School, an alternative high school, will discuss neighborhoods, the community, and schools from the perspective of the public schools, the parochial schools, and a community activist.

Wednesday, April 23: HOW DO WE GET POWER?

This discussion will be a summing up of the ideas and policies discussed previously. But more than that, we will try to focus on specific expereinces of the groups in attendance. Has a neighborhoods perspective as defined over the past five weeks helped you to think about city policy? Does it mean there are areas we can cooperate around? Are there new issues to organize people around?

"CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY ORGANIZING"

August 25, 1975
First Unitarian Church
21st and Chestnut Street

(Editor's Note: The Institute also helps neighborhood and labor organizations develop the practical skills needed for effective civic participation. On August 25, 1975, we sponsored what some reporters called the first "nuts-and-bolts" community organizing conference for neighborhood leaders in Philadelphia in many years. The conference examined techniques of block organizing, publicity, fund raising, lobbying, pressuring City Hall, challenging licensing and zoning decisions, and community organizing itself. The papers here reflect the basic organizing perspective offered at the conference. Some of them also appeared in the Neighborhoods Newsletter.*)*

ORGANIZING OUTLINE

For Organizing Neighborhood and Community Organizations

By

J. Paul MacGruther
Community Relations-Community Organization Specialist

I. General Concepts

A. Concept of Continuous Organizing

Organizing is a continuous process for any viable organization. As the organizing process ends, the vitality of the organization also begins to come to an end.

In other words, when an organization ends its organizing activities, that organization begins to die. It enters into its aging and death cycle; this cycle, though, may vary over short or long periods of time depending on the internal strengths of the organization.

B. Concept of Shared Leadership

In a democratic society viable organizations should further the principles of democracy. For this reason, the concept of shared leadership is extremely important. That concept is as follows:

Decision making should be vested in regular meetings of a general assembly of the citizens of the neighborhood or community

The role of the officers and executive board of a neighborhood or community organization should be only to implement the decisions and policies of a general assemble of the citizens of that neighborhood or community.

The officers and executive board should never be empowered nor allowed to make independent decisions nor set policies for the neighborhood or community organization. To do otherwise is oligarchic.*

The chief officers of the organization should be elected quarterly or semi-annually, with the positions being rotated among the largest number of persons possible.

II Types of Organizing

A Community Organizing

B Neighborhood Organizing

C Block Organizing

D Issue Organizing

III Organizing Techniques

A Community Organizing

1. Determine what the community is
   a. A community of neighborhoods with a geographic consciousness. For example, the Germantown Community in Philadelphia.
   or b. A community of people with similar ideological, cultural, class, racial or sexual consciousness.
2. Organize community leaders
3. The organizing of the community organization or association by community leaders.
4. Utilization of the concept of shared leadership.
5. Strengths and Weaknesses
   a. The strength of the organization depends on the number, personalities, and influence of the community leaders.
   b. The community organization may be strong in some neighborhoods and weak in others.
   c. There may be good cooperation or intense competition among different community organizations within the same community.
6. Illustrations
   a. Hartranft Community Corporation
   b. Germantown Neighborhoods and Project Areas Committees

B Neighborhood Organizing

1. Determine what the neighborhood is, its boundaries, its people.
2. Organize neighborhood leaders
3. The organizing of the neighborhood organization or association by neighborhood leaders
4. Utilization of the concept of shared leadership
5. Strengths and Weaknesses
   a. The strength of the organization

* Note:
An oligarchy is government by the few. An elected clique that controls a governing body or organization and excludes the general body of citizens from the decision making process is an oligarchy.

depends upon the number, personalities and influence of neighborhood leaders.

b. The neighborhood organization may be strong in some sections of the neighborhood and weak in others.

c. There may be good cooperation or intense competition with other organizations within the neighborhood.

6. Illustrations

a. Coopers'Point Neighborhood Action Group

b. Greater Morton Civic Association

c. Mill Creek Council

d. Wister Neighborhood Council

C Block Organizing

1. The block is the smallest geographical unit; it is an important key to the strength and effectiveness of the neighborhood or community organization.
2. Organize block leaders and residents.
3. The organizing of the block organization or association by block leaders and residents.
4. Utilization of the concept of shared leadership.
5. Strengths and Weaknesses

   The strength of the organization depends on the number, personalities, and influence of block leaders. It can also depend on the types of support provided by the neighborhood or community organization. Blocks should be continuously encouraged to participate in the activities and organization of the neighborhood and community.

6. Illustrations

a. Block organizing in the Englewood community of Chicago.

b. CLASP

D Issue Organizing

1. Determine the issue.
2. Organize concerned citizens around that issue.
3. Develop action oriented organization on neighborhood, community and city wide, county, state, and national levels.
4. Utilization of the concept of shared leadership.
5. Strengths and Weaknesses

a. The strength of the organization depends on the number, personalities, and influence of its members.

b. There may be good cooperation or intense competition with other organizations

6. Illustrations

a. Senior Citizen Action Alliance

b. Tenant Action Group

c. Welfare Rights Organization

IV. Organizing Synthesis

What I call the organizing synthesis is the combining of the organizing techniques outlined above into two organizing approaches in the dynamics of process in the organizing of a strong dynamic neighborhood or community.

Approach A

Begin by organizing on a block by block basis. When 25 to 30% of the blocks of an area are organized they should then form into an association of block organizations. When 50% of the blocks or organized they should take the second step and begin incorporating as a neighborhood or community association. Step 3 is to initiate a continuous process of block organizing (and reorganizing where needed) encouraging the blocks to elect representatives to the neighborhood or community association. The concept of shared leadership should always be emphasized.

Approach B

Begin by identifying neighborhood and community leaders. Set up the organizing meeting in which the neighborhood or community organization is to be born. Set up committees to develop operating structure, bylaws, and articles of incorporation. Assistance can be gotten through the Institute for The Study Of Civic Values, and through Community Legal Services. The next step is for the organization to initiate a continuous process of block organizing. First, survey the blocks of the area for block leaders or residents who are willing to represent their blocks at neighborhood or community meetings and be the conduit for information, notices, and newsletters to block residents. Second, work with block representatives and leaders in organizing the block. The concept of shared leadership should always be encouraged.

Illustrations

Nicetown Coalition – Approach A
Germantown Neighborhoods and Project Area Committees – Approach B

V. Resources

Council of City-Wide Community Organizations
1700 W. Thompson St., Phila. 19121, PO3-3660

CLASP (Citizens Local Alliance for a Safer Phila.)
1710 Spruce St., Phila. 19103, 732-4288

Institute for the Study of Civic Values
401 N. Broad St., Phila. 19108, WA2-8960

Alliance for Neighborhood Government
1772 Church St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, (202) 797-9034

VI. Readings

Neighborhood Power, The New Localism(Beacon Press, BP516), by David Morris and Karl Hess

Community Control (Pegasus, A Division of the Bobbs-Merrill Co., P1164) by Alan A. Altshuler

Neighborhood Government: The Local Foundations of Political Life (Bobbs-Merrill,1960) by Milton Kotler

BLOCK ORGANIZING WORKSHOPS

Bonnie Kowalski

Why:

1.) Creates a representative network
2.) Involves people at different levels of interest
3.) Gives leadership experience to more people
4.) Promotes racial understanding
5.) Promotes community wide safety
6.) Helps a community group work on a wide area of local needs without involving the same people

(Why is your group into block organizing? Should it be?)

How to Start:

1.) A block is all the houses which face each other from corner to corner
2.) Start by organizing your own block
3.) Convince someone else who has lived on the block a while to work with you
4.) Select a date convenient to those people working with you – then stick to it. Also select a home for the first meeting. Make the time during the week, evenings. Fridays and holidays are usually bad.
5.) In the first two meetings contact all block residents personally about the meetings. Personal contact is the key to success.
6.) Provide a written reminder of the block meeting to leave with people w!.en you canvass them

The Meeting

1.) Have people introduce themselves, give their address, and maybe say one sentence about something they would like to see happen on the block
2.) Encourage everyone to participate
    a.) have them talk out to all of the group
    b.) be firm with loud and insistent speakers, but try to keep friendly
3.) Make sure that each idea is followed through. But don't let the block take on too many projects – 3 is enough. Don't take on projects yourself. Make sure that most projects involve at least two people – ask for volunteers. Stress that no one should have to do it alone. Make sure that at some point during or after the meeting you ask one person out of each project group to be the "spark plug" or convener.
4.) Try to get the block to do at least one project that you know is simple and will work
5.) Be sure to arrange the time, date and place of the next meeting. Leave at least one month between meetings. Move around the place of the meeting so that people can share the hosing responsibility. Move around the weekday of the meeting so that it can include other residents.

Problems of maintaining blocks

1.) Presidents – choosing and motivating them
2.) Block projects – what can a block tackle without burning itself out

Relationship between block organization and the community organization

1.) What does your community group do about blocks?

For more information:

Bonnie Kowalski
East Logan St. Block Captain
CLASP Organizer
732-4288 or VI3-9262

NEIGHBORHOODS & BARS

By Conrad Weiler

(Editor's Note: This article originally appeared in three (3) parts in the February, March and September, 1975 issues of **NEIGHBORHOODS**, *a publications of the Neighborhoods' Project, Institute for the Study of Civic Values.)*

Even if your neighborhood is well organized politically and commands respect from City Hall, one agency of the state of Pennsylvania could determine by itself what kind of a neighborhood you will have. This agency has no interest in or knowledge of neighborhood planning, but has the power to make all "planning" seem useless. It is the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB).

The PLCB is charged with the responsibility of granting transfers of liquor licenses and enforcing the liquor laws at licensed establishments. This sounds harmless enough, but when we see how the LCB actually makes its decisions, there is considerable cause for concern.

As Chairman of the Queen Village Zoning Committee, I have spent much of the last year dealing with a rapid influx of liquor licenses into Queen Village, and have learned from bitter experience how helpless neighborhoods are under present laws.

The first problem your neighborhood will have in dealing with the LCB is finding out what is going on. The public notice that must be given when application for a license transfer is made is a single poster that must appear in a conspicuous place on the premises for 10 days.

In any case, if your community does not see this sign, you will miss your chance to be involved in planning your community, **unless** the police agree to call you whenever

they receive notice of a license application. The police are required to do a report on community opinion on whether the license should be granted.

Also, if you are in a renewal area, the Redevelopment Authority will also get notified, and may agree to notify you. Finally, the City Solicitor's Office may try to inform you if you request it.

Assuming you have actually learned that a license is planned, your group must take action **immediately**. If you do not fire off a **protest letter** to the LCB in Harrisburg immediately, the Board may decide to grant the license without a hearing.

Address protest letters to: Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board
Northwest Office Building
Harrisburg, Pa. 17124
Att: William J. Boyle

Do not assume that a hearing will automatically be held – the LCB can and does grant licenses without a hearing if it feels that there is no opposition. **Contact** the **District Police Captain** to inform him of your protest so he may include it in his report to the LCB. In addition, call the City Solicitor's Office and inform Ms. Susan Rudman (MU6-7570) of your interest in and opposition to the application.

The critical thing here is that if you do not protest immediately, you may forever lose your chance to make input. This is regardless of whether your group has had time to investigate and decide whether it actually opposes the license. Once you file a protest, you can always remove it after you have reviewed the application.

If your group does later decide to oppose the license or just meet with the applicant to get him to modify his plans (earlier closing time, etc.) the protest is your only weapon.

Many groups are afraid to protest until they have thoroughly investigated the situation. This is unwise. The protest is the only way for a neighborhood to be included in the decision-making process.

Critics of greater governmental powers for neighborhoods often argue that neighborhoods are too often **against** things and rarely **for** them. Yet here is a good example of how existing laws **require** opposition in order for the neighborhood to have any influence.

After you have accomplished the above and guaranteed a hearing, you must know how to effectively challenge an applicant.

How To Survive an LCB Hearing

There will probably be a very sharp, well-paid lawyer on the side of the applicant for the liquor license. This lawyer will make mincemeat out of your group unless you are well prepared.

Assuming your group has:

a.) met with the applicant and failed to reach an agreement with the applicant about the operation of his bar

b.) written to the LCB in Harrisburg demanding advance notice of the hearing date (send a copy of the City Solicitor – they will then notify you also when the hearing is held)

You should carefully study what the law requires in order to protest a liquor license.

There are four tests by which you can gain the right to oppose a license:

1.) Any person living within 500 feet of the proposed licensed premises has a "standing" to protest.

2.) Any "restrictive institution" – church, school, hospital, etc. – within 200 feet of the proposal licenses premises may protest.

3.) Any area wide association (neighborhood organization) representing persons within 500 feet of the premises may protest.

4.) Any other existing licensee within 200 feet may protest.

Ordinarily only 1 and 3 are open to neighborhood groups. However, you should always try to use the others if possible. If an owner of an existing license within 200 feet objects, you can hold up the new license indefinitely.

The law permits you to oppose a license only on the grounds that the new license will harm the health, welfare, safety and morals of any person or institution within the above four classes.

You **cannot oppose a license** for "good reasons" such as:
– an additional license will help turn the area into an entertainment district (which was our problem in Queen Village)
– a license is not planned for your community
– the license is illegal for the existing zoning. (Even though only C-2 or lower commercial uses permit liquor licenses, the LCB will grant licenses anywhere; it will leave it to the City and the neighborhood to fight over zoning)

The liquor license hearing is a "quasi-judicial proceeding". That means you will be sworn to tell the truth, and you will be cross-examined by the applicant's attorney. Since the rules of evidence are (loosely) applied, you may find that the opposition attorney will object to hearsay, personal comments, your motives, and even your right to testify. Hearsay means something someone told you or did for you, as opposed to something you know or did yourself.

Specifically, if you present a petition of 200 residents against the liquor license, but have not circulated any part of it yourself, the applicant's attorney will object that it is hearsay and try to throw it out (and probably succeed).

In this case the person who circulated the petition should testify, and should live himself within 500 feet and be an officer of an areawide organization.

In another example, neighbors of existing bars near a proposed license have told you of beatings, stabbings, rapes and murders, not to mention parking problems, prostitution, swearing, dope peddling, bottle breaking, and fights, vomiting,urinating and other spillover effects of the wrong kinds of bars in a neighborhood. If you testify that your neighbors told you about these things, it is hearsay and may be thrown out. You must personally have heard or seen these things in order to testify about them.

You as a community leader therefore have an obligation to see these things for yourself.

In addition, you will probably be cross-examined about

the membership of your group, how it reached its decisions, who participated, and possibly even be asked to produce written records.

Depending on the examiner present, you may not be allowed to testify at all unless you live within 500 feet, even though you are an authorized community spokesperson.

The hearing is conducted by an examiner, who is an attorney appointed by the LCB (usually through political connections) to act on behalf of the LCB. The examiner is "assisted" by a Deputy State Attorney General, who is there to represent the State's interests. The Deputy Attorney General should be contacted by your group in advance of the hearing.

If you do not have a lawyer, the Deputy Attrney General is your only hope of getting your side of the story explained. The Deputy Attorney General is not the attorney for your group. However, I have found that they do try to understand the arguments of the opponents of liquor licenses.

They try to give you a fair shake as they present evidence and witnesses to the examiner. The Deputy Attorney Generals are often overworked and busy; you must go over your case with them well in advance of the hearing. But remember, the Deputy Attorney General is not your advocate, but the State's.

He may not always follow your suggestions. The Deputy Attorney General seems very afraid of offending the examiners who run the hearings. Most of the time they try to hurry opposition testimony along, especially by consolidating it. Consolidating testimony means that everyone agrees to have one or two people speak for them.

Those not testifying then simply read their names and addresses and the fact of opposition into the record. While this pleases everybody, it should be done cautiously and carefully. You may lessen the impact of your opposition.

Following the hearing the examiner sends a report to Harrisburg. A few weeks later the five members of the LCB review and decide the case.

Since the people deciding the case did not hear it, it is important that you get everything into testimony you feel important. Write to the LCB to explain any additional part of your case. Contact your State Representative and Senator and ask them to push your position with the LCB.

Here, we present some changes which appear absolutely necessary.

First, the Governor must see that he appoints to the five-member Board, not spokesmen for the liquor interest, but at least one representative of urban neighborhoods. This should be required by law.

Second, the information flow to neighborhoods on liquor license matters is presently poor and must be thoroughly overhauled.

A notice should be published by the LCB showing all liquor license applications and transfers and relevant names, dates and other information. This notice should be sent out at least two months in advance of any decision or action to any neighborhood group or other group requesting it.

In addition, the frequent LCB practice of not answering letters or replying to telephone questions should be the subject of malfeasance and misfeasance prosecutions by the State Attorney General. Administrative action to get accurate information promptly to neighborhoods should immediately be taken.

Third, action should be taken by the legislature, the Governor and the LCB to change the "Star-Chamber" proceedings that constitute most liquor license hearings. Examiners must be instructed that the Pennsylvania Administrative Procedures Act requires the rules of evidence to be applied loosely in LCB hearings.

This is a ridiculous measure on concentration. It must be measured in terms of impact on an area, not on the basis of a few feet. Concentration should be measured over larger areas, and include measures of population density, traffic, noise, and other criteria, as well as, physical proximity. The physical proximity criterion itself should be expanded to a quarter of a mile, at least.

Finally, ask your neighborhood organization to study the matter of liquor licenses and take a position on changes that should be made. If you feel changes should be made, contact your State Representative, Senator and Governor about these changes. Ask them to introduce bills to make the LCB more responsive to neighborhoods, and ask to testify at committee hearings on the LCB.

Also, let Neighborhoods know of your actions so that coordinated efforts can be made in this area. We, in turn, will do our best to keep you informed about hearings and legislation in this area.

Mental Health Boards and Community Participation

by Jane Shull

Community mental health, and community mental health boards, are issues which many neighborhood leaders have paid little attention to in the past. As a result, many of the people who become involved in these boards have had little previous experience in citizen participation, and are less effective than they could be.

There are, of course, exceptions to this pattern, and some mental health boards have actually taken over control of the funds in their communities. We think the whole area of social services and neighborhoods deserves more attention, and we will be devoting space to it in future issues. This article will serve as an introduction to the area. Its subtitle could be, Why should you, as a neighborhood leader, care about community mental health?

Here are three important reasons:

1) **Mental health centers often create tremendous conflict in the community.** For years, the federal government has been emphasizing the neighborhood as an ideal location for mental health facilities. The idea is to get people out of the institutions and into the "real world." The government is trying to protect those who are locked away because one can or will take care of them where they live.

Unfortunately, neighbors often object strongly to half-way

houses, group homes, and similar facilities locating or expanding in their communities. Some people fear anything different moving into the neighborhood. Others are afraid that one institution will lead to others, until the area is overwhelmed by institutions. Whatever the reason, these residents often fight new programs in ways that help neither the mental health center nor the neighborhood. A community organization sensitive both to the needs of people as well as to the character of the neighborhood strengthens the community, not divides it.

2) Community mental health officials are often themselves insensitive to the community. Many of them are merely professionals who used to work in institutions under the old system. They find relating to the community a bother. Decent professionals in the field complain to us that some of their colleagues will never visit a client's home and that they will even diagnose everyday social problems as mental illness. A few centers have set up client advocacy systems to deal with these problems. A few use suggestion boxes. The Kensington Center at Episcopal Hospital has a client's rights handbook written by the community board. The only way to guarantee that the professionals will be responsive to the community, however, is by holding them accountable to community organizations.

3) Community mental health centers control funds in the neighborhoods. Community boards control the funds in six catchment areas: West Philadelphia Mental Health Consortium, North Central Philadelphia Community MHMR Center, Episcopal Hospital, Interac, Northeast Community Mental Health Center, and Base Service Unit in the Northeast. The funds for other centers, however, are controlled by the hospitals or mental health centers themselves. Why shouldn't neighborhood-based organizations exert this control throughout Philadelphia? Why should any outside institution be controlling important services in our neighborhoods? These are questions that neighborhood leaders ought to be asking.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

The Technological Society, Jacques Ellul, Anchor

Although turgid and repetitive, Professor Ellul's book remains the best single statement of what technology does to social values and human relationships.

"Power and Purity," by John Schaar, in *New American Review # 19*, Bantam

A succinct discussion of the rationale for political participation in a democracy. An extremely useful paper for discussion groups on the subject.

Participation in America, Sidney Verba and Norman Nie, Harper a& Row

The results of an extensive study of participation in political and non-political institutions in America. Undertaken in the late 60's, the study is considered to be the most sophisticated analysis of the subject to date. The authors conclude that social and economic class is still the most important determinant of who participates in America, but that group identity, ideological commitment, the size and autonomy of the relevant community exert powerful influence as well. A primer for anyone who wants reliable information on why citizens participate and what difference they make.

Job Power, David Jenkins, Penguin

A readable account of experiments in workers' councils throughout thr world. The author is somewhat prejudiced toward the United States, to say the least. Here, it seems, is the only place where workers' democracy works. His analysis of specific experiments is disputed by others who have looked at them. Nonetheless, *Job Power* remains a useful introduction to the field of industrial democracy, for those who believe political democracy is impossible without it.

Political Clubs in New York, Roy V. Peel

Another one of those books that paperback publishers ought to reprint. Now, it is available only in libraries. The author examines the techniques used by Tammany Hall to win support for the Democratic Party in the 20's and 30's. In the process, he tells much about building a sense of loyalty and commitment in the otherwise uncommitted. The analysis remains sound for organization builders today.

Rules for Radicals (Alinsky); *Action for Change* (Nader); *A Public Citizen's Action Manual* (Don Ross); *Storefront Organizing* (Sam Brown); *The Organizer's Manual* (OM Collective)

All are equally useful or useless, depending on what you think you can learn from them. If you expect insight into the basic techniques of organizing, you will not be disappointed. From Nader, Ross and the OM collective, you will gain information on specific issues and organizations as well. If you expect to learn how to organize entirely from a book, however, you ought to consider another field.

KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH THE INSTITUTE

The Institute Papers represents our basic theoretical and educational work to date. It offers a systematic statement of our philosophy, strategy and program.

In 1975-76, we will be expanding upon these efforts. In addition to our present newsletter,*Neighborhoods*, we will publish a new newsletter, *Work*, aimed at exploring new issues of the workplace, working people and the labor movement. We will develop new courses on *Contemporary Labor Problems* and *Theories of the Labor Movement*, following an evaluation of their content by leaders in worker education. We will be developing a new course in *Labor and Society* as well as a manual for the use of educational materials by the labor press. These texts will be available in late Spring, 1976.

The Institute will be publishing periodic papers this coming year as well, reflecting our perspectives on neighborhood, labor, and political issues. The Neighborhoods Project will issue four new reports on *Redlining and the Neighborhoods; Manpower and the Neighborhoods; and the Debate Over Neighborhood Government*. These will appear in the fall of 1975. Throughout the year, we will be releasing printed summaries of our labor and neighborhood education programs conducted through the American Issues Forum. Eighteen separate discussion guides will appear between October, 1975 and May, 1976, for use by organizations in the future.

How can you keep in touch with the Institute?

It's simple.

You can subscribe to our newsletter, *Neighborhoods*, for $5.00 (low-income rate – $1.00). Neighborhood organizations receive one copy free and special rates for bulk orders.

You can subscribe to our newsletter, *Work*, for $5.00 (low-income rate $1.00). Labor unions and university-based labor educators receive one copy free and special rates for bulk orders.

You can order syllabi and reports and dicussion guides individually, as they appear, or you can order the set now for $15.00, a substantial savings. Most of the 26 publications will cost more than $1.00 individually.

Or you can become an Institute Subscriber for $20.00 and receive everything – both newsletters, as well as all reports, discussion guides, and of course curricula.

Please fill in the coupon below and send with you check to:

SUBSCRIPTIONS
THE INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY
OF CIVIC VALUES
401 North Broad Street
Room 810
Philadelphia, Pa. 19108

I enclose: _____ I wish to:

_____ Subscribe to *Neighborhoods*
($5.00 per year)
($1.00 low-income rate)

_____ Subscribe to *Work*
($5.00 per year)
($1.00 low-income rate)

_____ Receive all Institute Reports, Courses, Discussion Guides
($15.00 per year)

_____ Become and Institute Subscriber and receive everything
($20.00 per year)

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____ ZIP _____

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION
(if applicable) _____

I would like to see the Institute sponsor a program or programs on : _____

_____
(please tell us)